The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Volume XXXV October 1961 Number Four

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 250

GUIDO DE BRES AND THE ANABAPTISTS 251
Leonard Verduin

SEBASTIAN FRANCK'S THEORY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE 267
Eugene Peters

ANABAPTISM IN WESTPHALIA 282
Cornelius Krahn

THE OTHERNESS OF THE CHURCH 286
John Howard Yoder

SEBASTIAN GERIG (1838-1924): HIS LIFE AND TIMES 297
Melvin Gingerich

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES 309

A Newly Discovered Source on the Transmigration of the Hutterites to Transylvania
Robert Friedmann

A Sixteenth-Century Anabaptist Evangelistic Testimony
Hans J. Hillerbrand

Menno Simons and the North American Mennonites of Swiss-South German Background
Harold S. Bender

BOOK REVIEWS 319

H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, *American Christianity*
Reviewed by Norman Kraus

J. A. Brandsma, *Menno Simons van Witmarsum*
Reviewed by Cornelius Krahn

Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*
Reviewed by Guy F. Hershberger

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXV, 1961 325

THE ANABAPTIST MOVEMENT DEVELOPED PRIMARILY IN THE TEUTONIC LANGUAGE area of Central and Western Europe, including the High German, the Low German, the Dutch, and the Swiss. It also spread into the French language area along the western borders of the German and Dutch area, but never became strong in these regions. The most significant development of French-speaking Anabaptism was in the territory adjoining Flanders to the south and west, although there were a sufficient number of French-speaking Anabaptists in Switzerland, especially near Bern and Basel, to call for the publication of a French edition of the Schleitheim Confession in the Neuchatel area.

Since very little has been written on French-speaking Anabaptists we are happy to present in this issue a study of the relation to the Anabaptists of a noted leader of the French Reformed movement, Guido de Brès, in what is now Belgium. The author, Leonard Verduin, himself a minister in the Christian Reformed Church, who recently spent a year abroad in special research on Guido de Brès, has been strongly interested in Anabaptism and has published numerous studies on Anabaptist themes in his own denominational press. He is well qualified to report on Guido de Brès and the Anabaptists.

SEBASTIAN FRANCK WAS NO ANABAPTIST, BUT RATHER A SPIRITUALIST, BUT HE was an influential writer and important independent thinker of the Reformatioin period. Although his major works were historical his philosophical-theological writings are also significant. The latter are, however, by no means always easy to understand. Eugene Peters offers a key to the understanding of Franck's ideas through an analysis of his theory of religious knowledge. His approach is new and fruitful, and opens up a perspective which will contribute much to a sympathetic appreciation of what Franck tried to say, even though his doctrines may not be very satisfying.

THE MUENSTERITES HAVE SO OVERSHADOWED THE ANABAPTIST MOVEMENT IN Westphalia that it has often been thought that Anabaptism ceased to exist there after the fall of Münster in 1535. Cornelius Krahn shows in his article on "Anabaptists in Westphalia" that Anabaptism not only continued there in strength after Münster, but that there was always a peaceful, nonrevolutionary Anabaptism apart from Münster, and that it persisted well into the seventeenth century.

BY THE PHRASE "THE OTHERNESS OF THE CHURCH" JOHN HOWARD YODER MEANS to say that the church cannot be the church as the New Testament proclaims it or as God intends it without being distinct from the unbelieving world and its culture. His penetrating essay traces the historical development away from the original expression of this vision in the early church through the Constantinian compromise, the medieval synthesis, and the Reformers' autonomizing of culture and vocation, into the full assumption that "we live in a Christian world." The shattering of this assumption in the contemporary experience of Christendom opens the way to a return to the true church in full "otherness," which deliberately tries to bring the Lordship of Christ to real fruit in the behavior of the church. This attempt, according to Yoder, requires the acceptance of three "scandalous conclusions": (1) that Christian ethics are only for Christians, (2) that there are certain apparently necessary functions of society in which Christians cannot be called upon to participate, and (3) that the "first and always" responsibility of the church to society is to be the church. The essay is in a real sense a judgment upon the contemporary church and Christendom. It

(Continued on Page 296)

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

GUIDO DE BRES AND THE ANABAPTISTS

LEONARD VERDUIN*

Guido de Brès (or de Bray) was one of the most important ministers of the Reformed churches in the southern Low Countries during the times when these churches were still illicit and for that reason *sub crucis*. Because he had many contacts with Anabaptism and Anabaptists he deserves a place in the REVIEW. In view of the fact that in 1961 it is four centuries since de Brès' most important work (the *Confessio Belgica,* one of the Forms of Unity of the Reformed churches of Dutch background) was published, the present is a most appropriate time. We shall sketch his life and his dealings with the Anabaptists.

De Brès was born at Bergen (Mons) in what is now southern Belgium. If we may trust contemporary guesses as to his age he must have been born about 1522. Of his early life very little is known and the little that we do have is innately mystifying. It occurs in a touching letter which de Brès wrote to his mother in 1567, during his final imprisonment. There he wrote:

> Recall how it has pleased God to call me to His service, contrary to to all human expectation. Yes, recall that while you were still carrying me you followed through the streets of our native Bergen a certain Italian Jesuit who was preaching in our streets. You said as you prayed, "My God, why hast Thou not given me such a son and why cannot the child I carry be such a son to preach the Word?" This you said and God has heard you. Yes, even as He is rich in mercy and able to do more abundantly than we ask, He has given

*Leonard Verduin is Director of the Campus Chapel at the University of Michigan.

> you more than you asked; you asked that your son might be like this Jesuit (but not of the new sect men are calling Jesuits). . . .

De Brès then goes on to show wherein the "more than you asked" consists, namely in the fact that her son was erelong going to a martyr's death.

From this passage it has been concluded, from very early times, that de Brès' parental home was fervently Roman Catholic. But there is something decidedly misleading about this passage. As it stands it cannot be accepted. For in 1521 there were as yet no Jesuits.[1] What are we then to make of de Brès' words? That his mother followed a street preacher and that she was so moved that she prayed as reported must be put down as fact; but the man was not a Jesuit. Nor was this a mere slip on the part of de Brès; for he at once informs his mother that "Jesuits" is the name of a "new sect." The anomalous reference to " a certain Italian Jesuit" was deliberate; and we are obliged to speculate as to the "Jesuit's" real identity.

If to indulge in a bit of such speculation is permissible in this context, the following data may prove at least interesting. Could it be that de Brès wrote as he did in order to shield his mother from almost certain trouble were he to call the street preacher by his real name? Was he perhaps a heretical street preacher? And if so, a Waldensian? We know that the Waldenses were very active in the vicinity of Bergen in the early sixteenth century. It is at least intriguing to recall that de Brès' given name was highly unusual in the Flanders of his time and that in the third decade of the sixteenth century a Waldensian from the Piedmont was in the vicinity of Bergen on an official fact-finding mission and that this man's name was Guido de Calabria. It is possible that our Guido was then named for this other Guido. It would be interesting and rewarding to examine the thought of our de Brès to see whether there are such things as Waldensian heirlooms there. But we hasten to put our feet on less speculative ground.

The next thing we know as a fact about the life of de Brès is that he went to England and spent at least some time there during the regime of the youthful Edward VI and Bishop Somerset, a regime that was so favorable to Protestantism that the England of those days was affectionately called *asylum Christi.* Here de Brès quite likely was intimate with such men as Valerand Poullain, Martin Bucer, John à Lasco, Walter Delenus, Maarten de Kleyne (Micron), and that remarkably capable elder, Jan Wtenhove. Probably it was

1 The Jesuit Order was launched by Ignatius Loyola in 1534 and was first recognized by Pope Paul III on September 27, 1540. Assuming that the Jesuits actually preached in streets they very certainly did not do so until late in 1540.

here that de Brès gained his remarkable theological acumen as well as his really amazing proficiency in Greek and Hebrew.[2]

It is highly probable that de Brès was already preaching before his excursion to England. There was at the time a severe wave of persecution at Bergen, in which a small community of Protestants was liquidated. De Brès was probably among the many who fled the country to escape this pogrom.

De Brès seems to have left England at least some time prior to the coming of Bloody Mary, whose fanatical hatred for all that was not Catholic made the colony of refugees scurry to the wharves to take any boat that was sailing.[3] Not the wrath of Mary, but a deep concern for the spiritual welfare of his own people, brought de Brès back to his native Flanders. We find him ministering to the *Kruyskercken* there as early as 1552. Flitting from place to place to elude the inquisitors he organized and edified congregations at Doornick (Tournai), Rijssel (Lille), Amiens, Valenciennes, etc. In many of these places de Brès had his helpers, men who carried on in his absence. He himself was constantly on the move. He frequently changed his name; and even at that his own parishioners knew him only by some given name. He constantly changed his outward appearance, now wearing a full beard and anon a clipped one. In his dress too he frequently changed his appearance. In this way he managed to avoid detection. No doubt his best work was done during these years, years which we could call his conventicle years. He would have been most happy if they could have continued.

This very fruitful period of activity was cut short by developments for which de Brès was not himself responsible. Late in September of 1561 the so-called *Chanteries* occurred in Doornick and in Valenciennes (at that time still part of the Low Countries and not, as now, of France); these were nocturnal street singings of the Psalms as recently versified by Clement Marot. These *Chanteries* disturbed the Regent, Margaret of Parma, no end. The reasons for this we shall discuss presently. Margaret appointed a Committee of Investigation; and it was the result of their diligent sleuthing that

2 Little or nothing is known of any formal schooling for de Brès; and yet his erudition was truly remarkable. Not only was he thoroughly at home in both Greek and Hebrew but he knew the Fathers by heart, so that as he lay in a dark hole of a prison he could recite them, quoting book, chapter and verse. Contrary to a common notion, he was not educated at Geneva, for he went there only late in life and then primarily to improve his Latin.

3 A contingent of these Reformed escapees, after having their ship frozen fast in the ice in the harbor of Wismar because the Lutheran authorities there refused to let them land, made their way in the dead of a Baltic winter to refuge in the city. Here the miserable refugees were shown considerable hospitality by the Anabaptists under Menno Simons (who refers to them as "Ingelschen" because they came from England; he also called them "Swingelschen" since their theology was dominated by Zwingli.) This kindness was ill repaid it seems, for a little later the refugees betrayed the whereabouts of the Anabaptists to the local authorities.

the presence of de Brès as well as his secrets became known to the authorities. He had a standing agreement with one of his parishioners that if and when danger appeared the latter was to set fire to the little garden hut that served as de Brès' study. The man bungled; the neighbors and the fire department rushed in to put out the fire. In the hide-out were all of de Brès' closely kept secrets, all his correspondence, his books with study-notes—in short, all the things he did not want the authorities ever to lay hands on. He was no longer safe in Flanders. No amount of precaution would be enough to permit him to remain on the scene. And so he fled.

When the authorities were unable to find the man they had him burned in effigy. A price was put on his head. He, however, managed to get to Sedan, where under the rule of the Duke of Bouillon, Henri Robert de la Marck, whose sympathies were with the Reformation, he was quite safe. Here de Brès and the wife he had married somewhat earlier and their little ones spent several happy and relatively quiet years. Here de Brès did much of his literary work. But there was a fly in the ointment: the pastor was unable to feed the flock he loved. His mind was constantly in the Low Countries.

The events of 1566, the "Year of Wonders," made it impossible for de Brès to stay at Sedan any longer. In spite of the extreme danger involved he begged leave of the Duke to return to Flanders. Henri Robert was loath to let him go, but finally gave his consent. De Brès went first to Antwerp, where he stayed only a few weeks; from there he went via Doornick to Valenciennes, arriving there on the evening of August 9. The massed preachings in the open fields (*hagepreeken*) were already in progress. Tensions were already extremely serious, tensions that precipitated the iconoclasm (*beeldenstorm*) a little later in the month. The area had by this time become solidly Protestant. Philip II knew that things were rapidly rushing toward revolution. He decided to make the city of Valenciennes a test case, sensing no doubt that the Huguenots from across the border were in large part the instigators of the trouble. He proposed the quartering of soldiers upon the turbulent town. When the citizenry, now almost completely under the sway of the consistory of the Calvinist church, resisted the King in this proposal he declared the city to be in rebellion. Siege followed. After a short but brave resistance the city fell before the cannon of General Noircarmes. As the troops began to pour over the battered walls the carillon pealed out the doleful cadences of Psalm 22 of the Genevan Psalter. "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Orders were to hang the preachers, whom the king held to be solely responsible for the rebellion, and to do so forthwith. But once more de Brès managed to escape. Just how he and his associates made good their escape is not clear, since the reports vary; but they were soon recognized, arrested, jailed, and sentenced to die; he by hanging.

On May 31, 1567, the executions took place. Death by hanging was chosen, rather than the usual death by burning in case of heresy, because de Brès and his colleague were deemed guilty of sedition. His last words, uttered while on the scaffold, were an admonition to obey the duly constituted authorities, a matter "in which some of you cannot possibly have a good conscience." The officer in charge, apparently embarrassed by this nonseditious speech, gave the signal to the hangman which cut short de Brès' speech. After he and his colleague, Peregrin de la Grange, a Calvinist *pur sang* fresh from Geneva (actually he was de Brès' opponent during those last hectic months in the doomed city), were pronounced dead the soldiers riddled the body of la Grange with bullets, burying de Brès without such outrage to his remains. The reason for this discrimination will, we trust, become clear as we proceed.

From this brief sketch it is apparent that de Brès' productive life fell in the two decades between 1547 and 1567. These twenty years were extremely momentous for the cause of the Reformation in the Low Countries. At the beginning of this period Genevan Calvinism made its first bid for the Dutch soul; at the end of it the victory of Calvinism had been completed. Prior to 1547 the prevailing variety of anti-Catholic dissent was Sacramentarian-Anabaptist; in that year Calvin's influence made its debut in the Low Countries. It seems that not the *Institutes* but rather Calvin's tracts against the Anabaptists marked the beginning of his predominance there.[4] It is quite likely that it was these tracts more than anything else that turned the tide against Anabaptism in these parts. These tracts, immediately put on the market in Dutch translation as well as in English, supplied the idiom for all subsequent Reformed polemics against the Anabaptists.

Although these tracts have certain good points they also have some very glaring defects. The image of Anabaptism contained in them is, to put it charitably, extremely tendentious. This is the more important in view of the fact that it was this image that prevailed for centuries among Dutch writers. Although modern scholarship has shown that this image is far from correct, it is still current

4 The tracts in question may be consulted in *Corpus Reformatorum*, XXXV, pp. 44-247.

at times in the writings that issue from Reformed circles in the Netherlands. Bullinger's book of 1560 against the Anabaptists, which was soon translated into Dutch, merely etched the Anabaptist picture more deeply.

Calvin knew no German, the language in which the Swiss and South German Anabaptists expressed themselves almost exclusively. This may account in large part for the distorted picture he drew of Anabaptism; for he had to depend upon others for his information concerning the movement. Nor did he have a chance to experience Anabaptism at first hand, since Anabaptism was relatively absent in French-speaking areas. One gets the impression that Calvin's delineation of the Anabaptists is drawn mainly from the medieval delineation of "the heretic" rather than from careful observation. This is the more important when it is recalled that it was Calvin's tracts that determined the course of Reformed policy toward the Anabaptists. As we shall indicate presently de Brès' evaluation of Anabaptism ran in the channels carved out by Calvin.

The fundamental difference between the Sacramentarian-Anabaptist[5] vision and that of the Calvinism that replaced it is to be sought in the doctrine of the church. In the views of the former group the church of Christ is a society within society; in the latter, church and society are co-extensive entities. In other terms, in the former vision men rallied to the concept of *Corpus Christi* whereas in the latter they rallied to the idea of *Corpus Christianum*. In the Sacramentarian-Anabaptist vision human society is at all times and in all places a composite thing, that is, made up of believers and unbelievers; in Calvin's system society is a monolith in which all men are at least in some sense included in the category "Christian." The Calvinism that crowded Anabaptism off the road was committed to sacralism, that is, to the view that a society must have a common religiosity if it is to function satisfactorily, that men must agree at the shrine before they can agree in the marketplace. Calvin's sacralism made him unhappy so long as the magistrates did not take in hand the reformation of the church; the Anabaptists were not happy unless the magistrates kept hands off matters of faith.

Genevan sacralism was an import into the Low Countries. It blew in over the southern border—as our own historian Motley was

5 Sacramentarians and Anabaptists (*Sacramentschwärmer und Wiedertäufer*) are closely related types. It is impossible to say where the one begins and the other ends. The denial of the miracle of the mass had been present and in volume in the Low Countries for many centuries before the sixteenth. Cornelius Krahn is certainly on the right track when he says on page 219 of *The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision* (Scottdale, 1957) that "certain basic elements of the Anabaptist movement of the Netherlands were native. They grew out of the Sacramentarian movement of the Low Countries, created in part by native religious forces. . . ."

the first to point out. In the victory for Genevan sacralism in the Low Countries it was not the native sons but the Genevan imports that were in the vanguard. The native sons, of whom de Brès was one, were not of themselves favorable toward reformation sustained by the sword. The soldiers officiating at the execution of de Brès knew very well that la Grange and de Brès were not birds of a feather; they were well aware that de Brès had pleaded ardently for coming to terms with the justly offended Philip; they may have known that it was to head off reformation by the sword that de Brès had left the safety of Sedan; they probably knew that one of the first things de Brès did when he arrived on the scene was to put an end to the volleys of shots from pistols with which the preachings were being punctuated; they must have known that during the days in which la Grange and du Jon (both of them fresh from Geneva) were in conference with the Nobles, at St. Thron, there were no *hagepreeken;* they no doubt had been apprised that it was not de Brès who had agitated for the celebration of a mass *Cene* (Lord's Supper) to which many thousands were expected to come, many from across the borders. So much were the soldiers aware of a deep-seated difference between the two victims that, as we have already reported, they made a difference between them even after they were dead. The hanging of la Grange went without incident; but a tumult arose when de Brès was being hanged, a melee among the soldiery that left many dead and wounded.

After the executions it was noised through the land that la Grange died obstinate but that de Brès had been *fort esbranle,* completely shaken. Some writers have extracted from this that at the end de Brès' faith had failed him. But of this there is no evidence whatever. So accustomed were men to associate Calvinism with political revolution that when they heard a minister in the Calvinist camp plead for obedience to the secular authorities they thought they were dealing with a man who had been "shaken." The plain fact is that de Brès was never a confirmed sacralist.

The native sons were not of themselves sacralists; and this made them much more conciliatory toward the Anabaptists. How far this conciliatory attitude could at times go may be seen from the fact that one of the native sons, Adrian van Haemstede, literally "lost his shirt" for going to the defense of the Anabaptists, for he was defrocked for it. It happened in the London settlement of which we have spoken earlier. Here the Genevan spirit evinced itself also when the emigrés from the Low Countries made it their business to warn the authorities against "the Anabaptist danger." When this

led to action against the Anabaptists in England it was van Haemstede who came to their defense. He said that they were "weaker brethren in Christ" and that when they died at the stake it was for the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He said that even in the difference touching the incarnation the conflict was about *circumstantia.* He even declared that in the vehement debates about the matter of the mode of Christ's incarnation men were "casting lots over His robe." This coming to the defense of the Anabaptists was too much for the Genevan sacralists, whose *bète noire* was the anti-sacralist Anabaptist! The Genevans went to the authorities and started action against van Haemstede, action that led to the man's demotion from the ministry and to his expulsion from the realm.

The *Chanteries,* of which we have spoken, were an early manifesto of sacralism in the Calvinist signature; they were an announcement to all comers that Doornick and Valenciennes were Calvinist cities now. Guido de Brès was from the outset deeply displeased over the singings. He had nothing to do with this sacralist manifesto and he deplored it. He felt that the singings were a big mistake, for "our cause would have been altogether secure without them." For him the conventicle was more in keeping with the spirit of Christianity than the public singings. In fact, he was conducting a conventicle in a private home during the very hour the Genevan sacralists were demonstrating outside. If he had been a man of bitter disposition he could have been very bitter toward those who were responsible for the singings that made further stay in his beloved homeland impossible.

With this as background we can now turn to de Brès' dealing with Anabaptism and Anabaptists.

Our de Brès came very early under the spell of the great Genevan. We find him at times speaking the very language of his teacher. Small wonder that in his treatment of the Anabaptists he follows Calvin closely, as we shall see.

But before we discuss de Brès' literary labors in so far as they deal with Anabaptism there is one item that requires our attention. It is the strange assertion occurring in a cryptic communication from his hand that it was to counteract Anabaptist inroads into the Reformed communities that he left the safety of Sedan to go to Antwerp. When a few weeks later he went to the border city of Valenciennes it was again to "oppose the Anabaptists." This is strange language; for defections to the Anabaptist camp were certainly no major challenge to the Calvinist communities of 1566. Moreover we hear nothing of any contacts with Anabaptists in the

Year of Wonders. Is it possible that the reference to an "Anabaptist" danger is another piece of cryptic writing such as came frequently from the hand of de Brès? Is perhaps de Brès concerned over the seditious phase into which his erstwhile flock is moving under the direction of the sacralists from the south? And does he write "Anabaptist" to shield his flock in the event his letter to them is intercepted (as indeed it was, for it survives among papers of State)? Can it be that "Anabaptist" is here a veiled reference to Protestants-now-gone-seditious? The letter is full of cryptic references; Antwerp is, for instance, called "Capernaum." Contemporary observers did indeed speak of sacralist Calvinists as "new Anabaptists"; the expression "Calvinistic Anabaptists" actually occurs. The events of Münster were still in men's minds, so that Anabaptists and seditionists were one and the same thing; it would not be strange at all to hear revolution-bent Genevans called "Anabaptists."[5a]

Three of de Brès' literary accomplishments demand attention now. We shall for the sake of brevity refer to them as the *Baston,* the *Racine,* and the *Confession,* and we shall treat them in this order.

The *Baston* (fuller title: *Le Baston de la Foy Crestienne, Livre très utile a tous Chrestiens pour s'armer contre les ennemys de l'Evangile, . . .*) was first printed in 1555. A later and considerably altered edition appeared in 1562; still another edition came from Geneva in the same year; another printing occurred in 1565. It appeared very early in a Dutch translation bearing the title *Staf des Geloofs.* An English translation of the original version is extant.[6] In this work de Brès evinces, especially in the older version, an appraisal of the ancient teachers and councils that is not at all typical of the Reformers in general. He actually goes so far as to say that they err seriously who go only to the Bible for support for their doctrine; we must just as surely heed the ancient doctors and councils. This trait reminds one of Peter Waldo and the Waldenses. The *Baston* has twenty-three chapters, the last three dealing with subjects that were in controversy between the Reformers and the Anabaptists. They have the headings: *"De ne contraindre personne a croire"; "Des Magistrats qui persecutent les fideles"; "Du Magis-*

5a Marcus van Vaernewyck refers to de Brès' letter to the Antwerp Calvinist consstorium in his book *Van die Beroerlicke Tijden n de Nederlanden en voornamelijk in Ghent 1566-1568,* 5v. (Ghent, 1872-1881) I, pp. 241 f. He quotes de Brès as saying: "I have been greatly grieved about what has been told me, that the Anabaptists are spoiling many of our people: I pray you, my very dear brethren, to look out closely for this evil, that you may keep your hands clean of the blood of those who have been placed under your charge." A. L. E. Verheyden, in his *History of Anabaptism in Flanders,* to be published at Scottdale, Pa., in 1961 or 1962, describes the relations of the Anabaptists and the Calvinists in some detail. He considers the reference by de Brès to be to the real Anabaptists, who had been winning over some Calvinists.

6 The library of Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, has a microfilm copy of this English translation.

trat civil et de sa puissance." In the course of his argument in one of these chapters de Brès sets forth "How the Magistrates Who Persecute the Believers under the Guise of Religion Will not go Unpunished." This is not as yet a typically Calvinist thought pattern. It is perhaps indicative of the man's movement toward Geneva that in the later edition he adds that this does not exclude the idea that the magistrate must punish perverse heretics. A careful comparison of the earlier and the later editions would be rewarding in many ways.

Far more important for our present purpose is de Brès' *Racine* (fuller title is *La Racine, source et fondement des anabaptistes ou rebaptizes de nostre temps, . . .*). It was first published in 1565; several later printings followed. It too was published in Dutch translation, with the title: *De Wortel, den Oorspronck, ende het Fundament der Wederdooperen oft Herdooperen van onsen tijde.*[7] A translation of a part of the *Racine* was made and printed in the New World in 1668 at Cambridge, Massachusetts, under the title *The Rise, Spring and Foundation of the Anabaptists.*[8]

The *Racine* is divided into three Books. The first deals with the history of the rise of Anabaptism; the second takes up the doctrine of the incarnation; the third is given to a discussion of baptism (with a discussion of the magistracy, the oath, and the sleep of the soul appended to it). The book opens with an "Epistle to the Church of Christ" by way of introduction.

In this introduction de Brès asserts that there are three outstanding "marks" by which the Anabaptists seduce many people. The first of these "marks" or characteristics is a fluency in quoting Scripture in support of their doctrines, albeit *"à tors et à travers."* The second "mark" is a "counterfeit holiness" (the undeniable fact of the Anabaptists' devout way of life was ever a hard thing for their adversaries to explain away). The third "mark" is said to be "their steadfastness in suffering and dying." The fortitude of the Anabaptists as they faced death was also a hard fact to deny; it had tremendous propaganda value, as their enemies realized full well.

The delineation of the rise of Anabaptism as given in Chapter 1 is faulty. De Brès derives Anabaptism from Storch and Müntzer; for him Münster is typical of the movement. He does not seem to know about Anabaptism in Switzerland and South Germany. As did many of his time and of times to come, de Brès treats the lunatic fringe of the movement as if it were typical.

7 A copy of this Dutch translation is in the Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen College, Goshen, Indana. We wish to express our gratitude to this library for permission to borrow this work.

8 A copy of this early translation is in the Huntington Library.

Book II of the *Racine* is a long and tedious refutation of the docetic Christology that some of the Anabaptists, notably Menno himself, had espoused. Although de Brès knew that not all Anabaptists consented to this docetism he continually speaks of it as an "Anabaptist doctrine." In this matter de Brès falls into the same error that Calvin made before him and fights a straw man to a large extent. He grants that in this matter "Dierick Philips [Menno's colleague] teaches to this day the same thing we teach, as do many of his disciples"; but then he turns right around to assail Anabaptism in general for a denial of the genuine humanity of the Christ. De Brès volunteers the interesting information that Menno also at first taught the orthodox view of the incarnation.[9]

In this long discussion about the incarnation de Brès, like Calvin, à Lasco, Bullinger, and Micron (to all of whom he acknowledges a debt), often makes a caricature of his opponents. He argues against inferences he (not they) draws from this or that statement made by the Anabaptist leaders. Often he gives the words of his opponents a thrust that they do not of themselves have. For example, de Brès accuses Menno of saying that "just as the rock in the desert became water, so did the Word become flesh"; but what Menno had actually written was:

> You ask me whence Christ derived His humanity? To this I reply, "From whence came the water which flowed from the hard rock?" Was it not produced by the omnipotence of God, to whom nothing is impossible? How did the Virgin conceive save through the power of God and the operation of the Holy Spirit, above the comprehension of all the philosophers?"

One gets the impression that it would have been good for all concerned if they had accepted at least this from Menno that the matter of the incarnation is and always will remain a grand mystery, *"een groote verholentheyt."* To this day the most astute theologian is unable to say just how Christ could really identify himself with fallen mankind and escape the taint of fallenness. This is a problem for the solution of which Catholic theologians have resorted to the notion of the immaculate conception of the mother of Jesus—a solution that is no solution at all, for it merely moves the problem back one generation. Menno was confronted with this mighty problem; he was not the most astute of theologians but he did the best he

9 The question may be asked what it was that led Menno to feel attracted to the docetic Christology of Melchior Hofmann. The vista opened by Cornelius Krahn is interesting, to say the least: "In Menno's Anschauung von der Menschheit Christi wird die bei ihm übliche scharfe Trennung zwischen Wiedergeborenen und Nichtwiedergeborenen, zwischen Gemeinde und Gesellschaft, bis in den Ursprung der Gemeinde durchgeführt." In his ardor to set forth a discontinuity between "the body of Christ" and mere humanity Menno was led to posit a discontinuity between the "Head" and mere humanity. This would make Menno's docetism the direct result of his repudiation of *Corpus Christianum*.

could with it. The man whose writings in the matter were mainly responsible for Menno's drift toward docetism—we mean John à Lasco—had used the Latin word *obnoxius* to describe the relation of Christ to human fallenness; the very same Latin word was used by him to set forth man's relation to this fallenness. This is tolerable language only if and when we make *obnoxius* mean "liable to" in the case of Christ and "under" in the case of man. This is subtle, if indeed it is proper; it was too subtle for Menno, and in his search for a less vulnerable position he backed into the docetic corner. He wanted, come what may, to keep his Christ free from the taint of fallenness—a not unworthy ambition.

De Brès seems to have enjoyed himself as he attacked Menno's idea that women "have no procreative seed." He declares that children are gendered from the substance of both parents and he illustrates this by pointing out that in the yolk of the egg the mother hen's "seed" is located. No doubt it would have been a great help if in the discussions the very unscientific word "seed" had not been used; for "seed," properly so called, follows upon the confluence of male and female; but the word "seed" was in common use and it is too much to expect of sixteenth-century man the insights into the how of procreation that modern man has. In these rounds with Menno de Brès has the better of the argument. With an erudition that is truly amazing he points out that the Greek of Hebrews 11:11 (*eis kataboleen spermatos,* rendered in the Vulgate *ad proiectionem seminis)* cuts the ground from under Menno's feet at this point. (On the other hand, de Brès' scholarship sometimes comes to grief; as when he speaks of *"monothelyte"* as a person. He also speaks of "Catharians" as though they were followers of one "Cathar." He speaks of Manicheans as though they were followers of one Manicheus rather than of a man named Manes—an error that occurs also in Article IX of de Brès' *Confession.)*

Chapter III of the *Racine,* on baptism principally, follows the usual line of argument. For de Brès the parallel between circumcision in the Old Testament and baptism in the New is pertinent in all details. At this point he makes assertions no Reformed person would make today. He wants all the little ones of "the people" baptized "without any differentiation, without taking into account whether their fathers were good or evil, individuals of honor or scamps." He treads on dangerous ground when he writes:

> We find in the Scriptures that Christ has two kinds of brothers; one after the flesh and after the spirit also, and one after the flesh only—just as there are two kinds of children of Abraham, two kinds of Jews,

> two kinds of Israelites. . . . The brotherhood which evil men share with the Christ is carnal only. . . .

The distinction of Christians in one sense and Christians in another sense is a device to which serious Christian thinkers who live in a sacralist climate have ever been driven; but it is not in the idiom of the New Testament. One can well understand that with such terminology the Anabaptists were only driven farther away.

The discussion touching the magistracy, appended here, contains the usual stock arguments. Like the rest of the Reformed thinkers de Brès thinks of the church as a socio-political entity; for him church and state are the warp and the woof of a single fabric.[10] As is well known by now, the Anabaptists pioneered for separation of church and state. But the Anabaptist contention that the sword has no place in the church constituted in the eyes of their opponents an attack upon the sword function as such. The sacralist cannot say yes to the sword without saying yes to it in matters of the faith; for that reason the Anabaptists' no to the sword in matters religious was taken by the sacralist to be a no to it in all its aspects. At this point de Brès goes round and round, as did his Reformed contemporaries. Like Calvin, de Brès insists that the sword must not be driven out of the church. Like Calvin, he draws an exact parallel between the Old Testament regime (in which the sword was used in matters religious) and the New. For de Brès as for Calvin the post-Constantinian world was an improvement upon the pre-Constantinian. Since the Anabaptists were firmly convinced that the Constantinian innovation was a step in the wrong direction, it is no wonder at all that they were sharply critical of the Reformers' view of the magistracy.

The sections on the oath and on the sleep of the soul present the same arguments one finds with the men on whom de Brès confesses to lean.

Before we leave the *Racine* we wish to comment on the engraving that appears on the title page of the Dutch translation of this work. It is a representation of the vision of St. Peter on the housetop, as reported in Acts 10. Encircling this picture are the words, "What God has cleansed call not thou unclean." The choice of this illustrative material was motivated by the appraisal of Anabaptism that is traditional to this day in the camp of the Reformed. To this day it is said that Anabaptism was at heart a system in which a false antithesis between nature and grace is rampant. In the language of a modern Reformed theologian in Europe,

10 To this day the Dutch word *gemeente* is ambiguous, referring to a sociopolitical unit as well as to an ecclesiastical. In some of our southern States the word parish has a similar dual connotation. This usage goes back in both instances to sacralist times.

> The Anabaptists always took their departure in a false antithesis between nature and grace; for that reason they were driven to their peculiar views on the incarnation as well as to their repudiation of infant baptism. They simply could not believe that the natural could serve the spiritual.[11]

In the wake of this analysis of Anabaptism the charge of dualism will be heard, as heard it is to this day. Now there can be no doubt that the Anabaptists applied a solvent to the monism that characterized the Reformed thinkers, for whom one and the same kingship of Christ embraced both the realm of the magistrate and the realm of the church. Nor can there be any doubt that the Anabaptist vision implied the secularization of the civil order, secularization in the etymological sense of secular, namely, pertaining to this age and to it only. In this argument the Anabaptists were saying things the Reformers needed very badly to hear. The monism of the one is as objectionable as the dualism of the other. The picture on the title page lands us squarely in this age-old controversy. The Anabaptist delineation of the function of the magistrate (a delineation that has become common property in much of Christendom by now, and will, if present trends continue, be appropriated by all of Christendom erelong) seemed to the Reformers to strip the civil order of its religious dimension. This was to call unclean that which God had called clean. Hence the insertion of this engraving on the title page of the Dutch translation of the *Racine*.

De Brès' *Confession* remains to be discussed. In this *Confession*, which stands as a binding creed in Reformed churches of Dutch ancestry to this day, the Anabaptists are referred to in several places. As de Brès wrote the text of the *Confession* they are mentioned by name twice; as the text stands today they are mentioned three times.

In Article XXXIV of the *Confession* the doctrine of baptism is put forth. In the last paragraph we read:

> Therefore we detest the error of the Anabaptists, who are not content with the one baptism they have once received, and moreover condemn the baptism of the infants of believers, who we believe ought to be baptized and sealed with the sign of the convenant, as the children in Israel formerly were circumcized upon the same promises which are made unto our children. . . .

Here de Brès accuses the Anabaptists of two things; first that they are not satisfied with one baptism. To be baptized a second time is for

11 Berkhouwer, the celebrated Calvinistic theologian of the Netherlands in our times, writes, as late as 1954, that the Anabaptists "altijd uitgingen van de tegenstelling tussen natuur en genade. Zij konden niet geloven, noch in de Christologie, noch in de leer van het verbond, dat 'het natuurlijke' een plaats kon krijgen in het verbond, omdat ze daardoor de 'geestelijkheid' van het verbond bedreigd zagen." (Cf. G.C. Berkouwer, *De Sacramenten*, Kok, Kampen, 1954, p. 230.)

de Brès as impossible as to be born twice. He seems not to have been disturbed by the indisputable fact that no Anabaptist ever entertained the idea of a repeated baptism; for them their own lustration was the first baptism. The other thing he has against the Anabaptists is that they withhold baptism from the children of believers. And to give force to this criticism he draws a parallel between circumcision and infant baptism. Although this parallel is endorsed by Reformed thinkers to this day no Reformed thinker, in the New World at least, would endorse de Brès' delineation of believers, for he equates the company of the believers, whose children are entitled to baptism, with the masses that compose "Christendom." Here much of the ground on which de Brès stands has eroded away.

The second mention of the Anabaptists occurs in Article XVIII, on the incarnation. Here we read;

> Therefore we confess (in opposition to the heresy of the Anabaptists who deny that Christ assumed human flesh of His mother) that Christ partook of the flesh and blood of the children. . . .

It will be noted that here de Brès accuses Anabaptists without distinction of docetic heresy. As we have seen he knew very well that many Anabaptists did not think along docetic lines. How he justified in his own mind this policy of putting all Anabaptists together is not apparent. It is only charitable to assume that de Brès had not read the testimony written by an Anabaptist prisoner:

> herewith we vehemently reject all those who allege erroneously that the Word did not really take on our flesh but brought with him from heaven into Mary an unheard-of humanity, whereby men construe the Christ to be heavenly not only as to the spirit but also as to the flesh, a representation from which flows error such as we leave to the well-intentioned reader to ponder, so that all office, achievement, suffering and death of Christ becomes a mere phantasy and appearance. . . .[12]

If he wrote as he did after reading such testimony, then we shall have to speak of deliberate falsification.

In a third passage in the *Confession* de Brès has the Anabaptists in mind but does not mention them by name. It is in Article XXXVI where the Reformed concept of the magistracy is set forth. We read that government is "for the punishing of evil men and the protecting of the good." This assignment requires the magistrate "to repress and to stand guard not only on the political level but also in matters ecclesiastical, for the suppression and liquidation of all idolatry and false service of God." Because the Reformed com-

12 We translate from "Ein Täuferbekenntnis aus dem 16. Jahrhundert" as printed and edited by Hans J. Hillerbrand in *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte,* L (1959) No. 1, p. 44.

munity believed thus, "therefore we reject all those who seek to repudiate rulers and magistrates, turn justice upside down, posit community of goods and confound that decency and order which God has instituted among men." It will be apparent that de Brès had the Anabaptists in mind when he wrote this, for this was the stock-in-trade of every polemic against them. But why did he not then name them? We know that he was a mild-mannered person; he said that Anabaptists should indeed be stoned but only with stones dug out of the Word of God. Probably he left the Anabaptists unnamed lest the *Confession* be the cause for still more burnings and garrotings of people whom de Brès considered misled.

Whatever may have been de Brès' reason for not mentioning the Anabaptists by name, the Reformed Synod of 1566 (it may also have been 1565), which met in order to revise the *Confession,* threw all restraint to the winds and boldly wrote: "Therefore we reject the Anabaptists and other mutinous people. . . ." It is this revised version that has prevailed in the Reformed churches. It is badly in need of revision; for no responsible person will without considerable reservation refer to Anabaptists *per se* as "mutinous people." It is closer to historic truth to say that they were less inclined to sedition than many of their contemporaries. Now that the Anabaptist vision of separation of church and state has become the prevailing tendency in Reformed circles, Article XXXVI causes embarrassment, so that revisions are all but universally restorted to.

As one ponders the polemics of Guido de Brès and his associates against the Anabaptists one thing is very clear; it is that the Anabaptists and their critics should have been willing to listen to each other so as to profit from each other. If, as it seems to the present writer, the Anabaptists in their haste to differentiate between church and society tended to fail in the assignment to be the salt of the world, the Reformers in their haste to integrate the two failed to differentiate between what is God's and what is Caesar's.

Very soon it will be 1967, the quadricentennial of the year when de Brès was hanged at Valenciennes. It would be a good service on or before that date to give the English-speaking world a historically correct portrayal of the man and his times. Such a biography could and should set straight the distorted image of Anabaptism that has too long been in vogue in Reformed circles.[13]

13 To date just about all that has been written on de Brès has been done in languages other than the English. The best work is in Dutch: Van Langeraad, *Guido de Bray, Zijn Leven en Werken* (Zierikzee, 1884). Another good biography is Daniel Ollier, *Guy de Brès, Etude historique* (Laigle, 1883). Recently a new work has appeared, likewise in French, E. M. Braekman, *Guy de Brès* (Brussels, 1960). This work by Braekman is on "sa vie" and is to be followed by a companion volume, on *"sa pensee."*

SEBASTIAN FRANCK'S THEORY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EUGENE PETERS*

INTRODUCTION

This article is an attempt to extrapolate Sebastian Franck's theory of religious knowledge from his most explicitly philosophic writing, the *Paradoxa.* Few words need be written in praise of Franck. His temperament and perhaps even his philosophical and theological outlook have considerable appeal for the modern Western man, if not for the modern Western theologian. Contemporary relativism in religion finds a historical predecessor in Franck, whose ideal of impartiality and spiritualism combined to yield a thoroughgoing individualism. God, claimed Franck, has no favorite religious denomination or sect and consequently neither does the man in whom God's spirit resides. To the contemporary theologian who is struggling to refurbish the mighty fortresses of Luther and Calvin for today such an impartial position is perhaps as abhorrent as it was to the Protestants of the Reformation. Yet, even if Franck's theological position be criticized as a modernism from the "womb untimely ript," still Franck's tolerance and gentleness during a period of violence and vituperation can hardly fail to elicit respect.

Franck's attitude towards his contemporaries hardly reciprocated the hostility showed toward him. Luther is reported to have regarded Franck as one of the *Schwärmer,* but did not even deign to mention him until after his death.[1] Erasmus, whom Franck mentions quite favorably in his *Chronica, Zeytbuch und Geschychtbibel,* openly opposed Franck after the publication of *Chronica* in 1531.[2] Franck was almost exclusively an object of rebuff, if not persecution, by all three prominent religious groups, the Roman Catholic Church, the Reformed Church and the Lutheran Church. Even the "Left Wing" rejected him.

Although Franck for his part obviously felt critical of the Anabaptists at the time of his translation of Althamer's *Diallage* (*ca.* 1528), which was directed against the Anabaptists, he soon adopted his characteristic position of impartiality. His impartiality, though,

*Eugene Peters prepared this paper for Professor James Luther Adams of the Harvard Divinity School.

1 Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (New York, 1956), II, 971, footnote 484.

2 Erasmus is listed as one of those who were labeled heretics by the church, but who really represented true religion as Franck understood it. *Cf.* Sebastian Franck, *Chronica, Zeytbuch und geschychtbibel von anbegyn biss inn diss gegenwertig A.D. xxxj. jar.* (Strasbourg, 1531), folio ccxci. Hereafter cited as *Chronica.*

did not confine him to some sort of ill-conceived attempt to be "all things to all men." On the contrary, he explicitly avowed his admiration for Bünderlin[3] and used ideas of Schwenckfeld in his own writings (*e.g.,* Schwenckfeld's "apostolic man" is adopted by Franck as the "holy community" of the ultimate stage in history). Nor did Franck hesitate to disagree with his contemporaries. For example, he recognized the dangers of "enthusiasm" and pointed out that "signs," *i.e.,* visions, excitation and dreams, might well accompany inner illumination, but do not necessarily demonstrate the working of the Spirit of God. Just the reverse is true: Only the working of the Spirit validates enthusiastic "signs."[4] Franck's justification for writing the *Chronica* is characteristic of his attitude toward his contemporaries: ". . . in order to give others some reason as to whether God will suffer the world to endure any longer so that we may more zealously note, and thus not be so loath to describe, God's work."[5]

The Paradoxa—The general structure of *Paradoxa* is rather simple. A relatively short preface is followed by a series of two hundred-eighty paradoxa, generally standing in a somewhat arbitrary arrangement. Each paradoxon or group of interrelated paradoxa is followed by an exposition with great variation in length (from one short paragraph to several pages). The expositions, frequently employing abundant imagery and concrete examples, generally offer some sort of resolution of the paradoxon by means of Franck's distinction between World *(Welt, Schein)* and Spirit *(Geist, Sein).*

The book was apparently intended to present a philosophy or theology correlative with Franck's concept of religion. On the first page of the preface Franck wrote: "I have, then, given this philosophy of mine the title *Paradoxa,* and used 'Wunderrede' or 'Wunderwort' as the German equivalent of 'paradoxon' because theology is nothing but an eternal paradox."[6] Presumably Franck thought of himself as presenting a philosophy in *Paradoxa;* but this statement suggests that philosophy and theology were not sharply distinguished in his mind. Parts of the title also suggest Franck's purpose: "A true, divine philosophy and German theology for all Christians philosophizing in God" and "also for the sharpening of judgment." But the book was primarily addressed to the common people rather than a select, highly educated group. This is suggested by Franck's use of concrete examples, his translation of Latin quotations and his re-

3 Letter to Johann Campanus, 1531.
4 Sebastian Franck, *Paradoxa,* tr. H. Ziegler (Jena, 1909), 215.
5 Franck, *Chronica,* "Vorred."
6 *Paradoxa,* p. 1.

peated criticism of the learned class *(Gelehrten).* Indeed, Franck's outlook forbade him to address his words to a special class, but led him to speak to men of all conditions.

Exposition

Theory of Paradox—The word "paradox" was not reserved in Franck's time only for propositions of a paradoxical nature according to strictly logical understanding. A logical paradox might be defined as a special case of those types of propositions which, whether assumed true or false, imply self-contradiction. Franck apparently was not thinking of propositions of this sort when he used the word "paradox." What then did he mean? Franck writes: "A paradox . . . is an expression which is certain and true, but which the whole world, in the human manner, by no means holds to be true . . ."[7] Franck's concept of paradox, then, does not refer so much to logic as to Weltanschauung. To some extent it is a psychological concept; but it is not entirely so, for Franck maintains that his paradoxes refer to reality independent of the thinker. In other words, paradox seems to perform a double function for Franck: it is intended to communicate and is based on a frame of mind or attitude; but it also refers to objective reality as opposed to experiential reality.

An examination of Franck's definition of paradox reveals that Franck believed one "side" to be true, the other to be false. The worldly "side" is false because it does not correspond to reality, but rather is the negation of truth. Thus Franck's paradoxes assume the nature of logical paradox only in terms of world *(Welt),* which is an incorrect viewpoint. From the viewpoint of spirit *(Geist)* the paradox differs from the strictly logical paradox in the decisive characteristic of viewpoint. The logical paradox assumes a paradoxical nature because it is viewed solely from the standpoint of pure logic; Franck's paradoxes receive their identifying characteristics from their inherent double viewpoint, the antithesis between World and Spirit.

Franck initially attaches the idea of paradox to Scripture,[8] which is interpreted in antipodal terms by "worldly" and "spiritual" men. On account of "worldly" men the Scripture speaks in parables and hides its true meaning beneath the dead letter.[9] Others, though, through the light of the Holy Spirit are awarded the gift of understanding the true meaning of Scripture in its depth. Once Franck

7 *Ibid.*

8 See the title of Paradoxa, ". . . Wunderred und gleichsam Räterschafft/ auss der H. Schrifft/. . . ."

9 *Paradoxa,* p. 2. Here Franck refers to Matt. 12:34-37.

establishes paradox in reference to Scripture, he proceeds to equate theology with the correct interpretation and understanding of Scripture.[10] From this point the concept of paradox is extended to an inclusive level embracing a universal conflict between spirit and world.[11]

Franck's idea of paradox pervades his work. Not only does it appear as a set form of literary composition in *Paradoxa,* but it also functions both as a structural principle on a large scale for some of his writings *(e.g., Ketzerchronik)* and as an innuendo in the titles of some of his shorter writings (e.g., *Griegsbüchlein des Fridens).* More specifically, in *Paradoxa* Franck uses his idea of paradox in two major ways. He often presents the caption-paradox in the blunt form of an oxymoron, as in Paradox 55, and in this way suggests the sharply self-contradictory form of a genuine logical paradox. Secondly, in his expositions he resolves the apparent logical paradox explicit or implicit in the caption by means of his own concept of paradox as antithesis between spirit and world.

Resolution of Contraries. The antipodal relationship of spirit and world which underlies Franck's idea of paradox appears in its initial stage of development even as early as the foreword of Franck's translation of Althamer's *Diallage.* There the conflict between spirit and flesh is described in terms of Christ's struggle with the flesh in each man. If the spirit resides within a person, it cannot sleep but must act.[12] Also in *Chronica,* written four years before *Paradoxa,* Franck's preface suggests the notion of a dichotomy between world and spirit.[13] With the writing of *Paradoxa* this dichotomy was developed into a universal antithesis. God and the world stand at opposite poles. God is truth *(Wahrheit)* and being *(Sein),* and the world is appearance *(Schein).* But only God, and the man open to the inspiration of God, can comprehend true being. The man not so inspired is doomed to take the realm of false being as true being, *Schein* as *Sein* and world as spirit.[14] For God and the man of spirit nothing can be the same as it appears to worldly eyes; but everything is reversed.[15] Franck feels the antithesis between world and

10 *Ibid.,* p. 1.

11 Franck finds Biblical support for his belief that these two aspects or realms, world and spirit, stand in conflict. On Moses' command to regard as unclean all animals with cloven hoof, Franck writes in *Paradoxa* 57, p. 87: "This is to be understood allegorically, that all things are split and have two aspects—one according to man and the other according to God."

12 Christiane Kolbenheyer, *Die Mystik des Sebastian Franck von Wörd* (Würzburg, 1935), 7.

13 Franck, *Chronica,* "Vorred": "Was du nun hie in diser Chronik sihest geschehen sein/ allweg un versehenlich/ dz die welt nicht wenigers besort hat/ des haben wir uns gleich wol gwisslich zuuersehen/ und nichts gwissers zugewarten."

14 *Paradoxa* 57, p. 87. Cf. *Paradoxa* 57, p. 88: "Was da Ja ist, ist hier Nein und umgekehrt;" and *Paradoxa* 64, p. 93, "Also wird Schein und Sein ewig wider einander bleiben."

15 *Paradoxa* 91, p. 125.

spirit so strongly that he not only claims God's nature *(Art)* is the opposite *(Widerpart)* of the world,[16] but he even asserts: "If you hear the rabble speak, believe and hold anything, then hold, speak and believe the contrary; then you will certainly have the Gospel and God's Word."[17] Truth is spiritual and invisible, and therefore is the opposite of worldly appearance and form. This idea that truth is to be grasped by taking the opposite of whatever is worldly is repeated throughout *Paradoxa.*[18]

The ontic split between *Sein* and *Schein* as implied in these statements is not left in broad metaphysical terms, but is carried to the human level and even located within man himself. Every man is split within himself and is two men, an outer man of appearance and an inner, essential man. These two aspects of man, though bound together in one man, are by their very natures always set against one another in conflict.[19] But what does it mean to talk of true being (inner man, *Sein*) and false being (outer man, *Schein*)? Franck refuses to admit the nonexistence of sin and evil. All the world's art, wisdom, piety and light, wrote Franck, is wicked blind darkness, foolishness, sin and death in the sight of God.[20] Do the terms "true" and "false," then, merely indicate a surreptitious axiology concealed within Franck's ontology or do they have genuine ontological significance? When Franck writes "Outside of God we are naught," and then follows this with the statement, "All our works before regeneration *(Wiedergeburt)* are all alike sin," the implications lead to most difficult questions. *Wiedergeburt* is equivalent to *Gottseligkeit,* which means "faith and submission *(Ergebung)* in God."[21] Then, how can "naught" produce "works" of any sort? If the realm of spirit *(Sein)* is genuine reality, what is the ontic status of the realm of world *(Schein)?*

If *Schein* refers to nothingness, does this mean ontologically nothing or merely man's misinterpretation of being (*Sein*)? If *Schein* is ontologically nothing, then the world of appearance would be literally nonexistent. But Franck maintains that there is *Schein.* On the other hand, if *Schein* is merely man's misinterpretation of being, then how is Franck's distinction between outer and inner man to be explained? How can outer man result from man's misinterpretation of himself *(i.e.,* of inner man), especially when the misinterpretation must be an action of inner man? How is the existence of

16 *Paradoxa* 15, p. 34.
17 *Paradoxa,* preface, p. 12.
18 See *Paradoxa* 14, p. 33. See Alexandre Koyré, *Mystiques, Spirituels, Alchimistes* (Paris, 1955), 34.
19 *Paradoxa* 79, p. 96, and *Paradoxa* 252-253, p. 294.
20 *Paradoxa* 186-89, p. 235.
21 *Paradoxa* 214, p. 253.

misinterpretation at all to be explained?[22] If misinterpretation existed, it two could have being and therefore participate in God (which Franck would not admit) or it springs from man's "imprisoned will," *i.e.,* enslaved to evil.[23] But if man's will can be enslaved to evil, then evil must exist, *i.e.,* have being. Therefore, *Schein* cannot be ontologically nothing, because Franck maintains that *Schein* exists; nor can *Schein* be merely man's misinterpretation of being (and consequently without being), because the existence of misinterpretation imples that *Schein* has being.

If *Schein* is not nothing, it must be being of some sort. But two major arguments against the genuine reality *(i.e.,* the being) of *Schein* are implicit in Paradoxa. The first argument is that if *Schein* is being, it participates in God; but this is impossible because God stands in antithesis to the realm of appearances.[24] The second argument is that Franck repeatedly describes the realm of world as mere appearance and refuses to grant *Schein* reality. In reply to the first argument perhaps it may be maintained that *Schein* is to be defined as that very being which does not participate in God. Then how is the second argument to be answered? Franck maintains that *Schein* is nothing. Yet, although *Schein* is nothing, it exists; and, if *Schein* exists, it must have being. Franck's antithesis, then, between *Schein* and *Sein* is not to be understood literally as an antithesis between being and nothingness. What, then, does Franck mean when he refers to *Schein* as nothing?

The answer seems to lie in an extrapolation from Franck's concept of the religio-moral *(religiös-sittlich)* life. For Franck religion and morality, theology and philosophy, are inseparable. Every theological statement has moral implications. More broadly, metaphysical or ontological statements are inextricably interwoven with moral or axiological statements. When Franck distinguishes between *Schein* and *Sein,* he is speaking in both ontological and axiological terms. Ontologically he is implying that *Schein* is being that stands against God as a kind of inexplicable surd in the cosmos. Axiologically he is implying that *Schein* is disvalue as opposed to ultimate value, *Sein.* The contrast here lies between the axiological being of the true and of the good and the axiological being of the false and of the evil. Thus Franck's statement, "Outside of God we

22 E.g., in *Paradoxa* 2, p. 17, Franck writes that the world is condemned by God. But how could that which is nonexistent be condemned? In the preface to *Paradoxa, Buchstaben* are granted enough reality to conceal the real meaning of Scripture. In *Chronica,* folio, vii, Franck implies that *Fleisch* exists, because *Geist* struggles against it. In addition, if *Schein* is ontologically nothing, how may Franck write: "Die Welt ist mit sich selbst uneins und gespalten." *Paradoxa* 187-89, p. 230. How can that which is nonexistent be split?

23 See *Paradoxa* 264-68, p. 313.

24 *Paradoxa* 2, p. 16.

are naught," is to be interpreted either as an inconsistency unworthy of Franck's intellectual capabilities or as an axiological expression indicating the value of *Schein* by the criterion of *Sein*. In short, *Schein* is ontologically something (i.e., being), but axiologically *Schein* is nothing (i.e., disvalue) compared to ultimate value, *Sein*.

Inner unity in God. Despite the split between *Schein* and *Sein* a fundamental unity underlies all being, namely, God. Reason cannot grasp this fact. Indeed, one of the major purposes of Franck's paradoxical method is to drive the rationalist to the point of desperation at which he is willing to abandon reason and to leave himself open to the influx of spirit. Only the person inspired by spirit can grasp the unity of being in the face of the paradox, *Schein* vs *Sein*. He who dwells in the realm of *Schein* sees his existence as enigma. He cannot understand his own life or the world in which he lives. He who dwells in the realm of *Sein* overcomes the *Schein-Sein* dichotomy and views existence under aegis of *Sein*, which is genuine being.

Spirit and the Inner Word. Franck's experience in university and parish led him to the belief that neither externals nor the Bible but rather spirit is the key to true religion. His emphasis on inner religion arose primarily from his rejection of the ritualistic, bibliocentric and rationalistic approaches characterizing the religion of his age. Thus Franck turned to inner authority, not as a result of purely theological theorizing, but in an attempt to develop a nonsectarian *(unparteiisch)* religious orientation immune to the extremes of rigidity and enthusiasm characteristic of the various groups.

To Franck inner religion means religion of the spirit, the spirit of God and of man. The spirit of God is the divine word, the word of God; the spirit of man is man's assimilation of the word of God, which thereby becomes the inner word.[25] The word of God issues directly from the mouth of God without intermediary and leads man directly to God. Christ is therefore not the intermediary between God and man but is the very spirit of God and also the spirit of man. Christ then is identical with the inner word.[26]

But what is the inner word? Can anything be said of it other than to equate it with God's word and Christ? First of all, "word of

25 Alfred Hegler, *Geist und Schrift bei Sebastian Franck* (Freiburg i.B., 1892), 86.

26 Kolbenheyer mentions that Franck's doctrine of the Logos is directly dependent on that of the Greek Church Fathers, Kolbenheyer, *op. cit.*, p. 29. In reference to this point it is interesting to compare some remarks of Origen with Franck's concept of Christ as the inner word. Cf. Origen's *Commentary on John*, II, 2 f. Also it is notable that Origen appeals in *Against Celsus*, V, 63, for toleration of heretics. These similarities suggest the possibility of a more extensive investigation of the influence of some of the Greek fathers and especially Origen on Franck's thought.

God" clearly does not mean Scripture. Franck utterly rejected this view of the magisterial Reformers. The inner word is God's word subjectively regarded. From an "objective" standpoint God's word is the invincible power of God.[27] It is that aspect of divine being accessible to creatures which goes forth but never away from God.[28] In men, though, the word of God as the inner word is not an objective possession but exists only insofar as it is effective and creative in man, who can by his own actions darken the light of the inner word but never completely extirpate it. Yet man does not grasp the word of God; the word grasps man. And because the divine word is eternal and unchangeable, it is eternally present and active to some extent in man as man's very being. It is "shining light," the kingdom of God within.[29] Even more, the inner word is God within man, who, as a spiritual being created in the image of God, is by nature granted revelation of God.[30]

The locus of the inner word is variously given as the heart, the soul, the ground of the soul, the feeling *(Gefühl)* and the disposition *(Gemüt)*. Its location can not be defined precisely because the word acts as an experienced power striking man's affective rather than his intellective faculties.[31] The power of God touches man at the point of his susceptibility *(Empfänglichkeit)*. Thus the word does not require from man the active role of intellectual striving but the passive role of sensitivity and yieldedness *(Gelassenheit)*.

Although the inner word permanently resides within man, the ontic dichotomy between *Schein* and *Sein* necessitates the existence of a "fleshly" heart standing against the "spiritual" heart. And so Franck refers to the world's heart, which believes in no God except the devil, who darkens the worldly heart with his spirit.[32]

Man's Role. Because both a spiritual heart and a fleshly heart exist within man, the necessity for choice arises. Man must choose to turn to spirit or flesh. God, wrote Franck, is like the sun. No one can stop the sun from shining, but anyone can prevent the sun from shining on himself by walking into the shade. " (God) in and of himself has no will, but only as He wills in us; such can no one withstand. He however wills, as each one wills, for each one."[33] When man wills to turn from evil (the fleshly, worldly heart) to good (the spiritual heart), it is God willing man to do so because God so grasps

27 *Paradoxa* 12-13.
28 Kolbenheyer, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
29 *Paradoxa* 1, p. 15, "Kinder, ihr müset allen Bildern den Abschied geben, zu Gott einkehren in den Grund der Seele, da sollt ihr Gott finden, denn das Reich Gottes ist in euch!"
30 *Paradoxa* 101-2, p. 138.
31 Hegler, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
32 *Paradoxa* 18, p. 42: *Paradoxa* 15 ff., p. 37; *Paradoxa* 187 ff., p. 230.
33 *Paradoxa* 24 f., pp., 55 f.

the heart of man that he is naturally led to the spiritual heart. But this should be understood as an inner force, not as external compulsion.[34] By turning to the spiritual heart, which is his genuine being, man leaves himself open to God *(Gelassenheit)* because he is turning from the self-centeredness of the fleshly heart to God within. Once man has decided for God, the Word and Christ, he becomes an invincible believer who is impervious to the world.[35]

Reason. If the word of God inexpressibly grasps man's heart, does human reason play any role other than self-abnegation in *Gelassenheit?* Is Franck's concept of reason completely defined when he writes: "For each his wisdom and his reason are an idol"?[36] Or is it more accurate to say that Franck attacks reason only when it is used improperly?[37] The answer is that reason must be seen in the context of the dichotomy between *Schein* and *Sein.* Thus Franck speaks of "worldly reason" and of "illumined reason."

Worldly reason characterizes the man without God, who lives in and reasons about the realm of *Schein.* On this level worldly reason is adequate, due not so much to its inherent capabilities as to the dubious value of *Schein.* Worldly reason can grasp and order *Schein* only because this is the realm of flesh and things. Worldly reason is peculiarly appropriate to the realm of world. Thus reason is acceptable provided it remains within its proper realm, *Schein.* But Franck does not precisely define the meaning of worldly reason. Perhaps he means conceptualization and syllogism, since these characterize the relationalism Franck was opposing in scholasticism, Aristotelianism, humanism and the calcifying theology of the Reformation. In areas in which only conceptualization and syllogism are demanded, worldly reason is valid and desirable. But when worldly reason attempts to go beyond these areas and to encroach upon the realm of spirit, which is characterized by experience *(Erfahrung)*, then worldly reason becomes corruptible and pernicious. Rational speculation about God is self-defeating effort and leads only to false answers.[38] Worldly reason cannot grasp the basic unity of reality; it hinders even recognition of that basic reality.[39] It is interesting to compare Franck's view of reason with Luther's, espe-

34 *Paradoxa* 19 ff., p. 49, "Dennoch handelt der freie Gott nicht mit Gewalt oder ohne uns oder wider uns, sondern in uns und mit uns und unseren Willen."

35 *Paradoxa* 12 f., p. 30.; *Paradoxa* 79, p. 98.

36 *Paradoxa* 149b, p. 183.

37 *Paradoxa* 190-93, p. 240, "Wer immer zu zeitig grübelt und vorwitzig viel frägt, nur dass er nicht ohne Wissen gesehen werde und sich nachmals in diesem Licht rühme, der kommt je länger desto weiter von der Bahn, und je mehr er also Gott verkehrt und fleischlich, nicht in aller Gottesfurcht sucht, desto mehr verbirgt sich Gott von ihm. . . ."

38 Hegler, *op.cit.,* p. 112.

39 *Paradoxa, loc. cit.* Cf. p. 237.

cially in view of Luther's great influence on Franck.[40] Both men believed that reason could be used against itself. That is, the limitations of worldly reason can be revealed by means of its own techniques.[41]

Although Franck derogates worldly reason, he does not categorically reject all use of reason in religious questions. "We should . . . not cease to philosophize in God as to how to fight, how to rise from one clarity to another, how to sharpen our judgment daily. . . ."[42] Were reason completely excluded from the realm of religious experience, the indwelling of the spirit would become a mechanical operation lacking man's free co-operation. But Franck regards man as playing a significant role in religious experience and therefore distinguishes between reason *per se* and reason illumined by the word of God. Indeed, such illumined reason not only enables man to judge of ultimate matters, but is actually man's "natural, primordial reason."[43] But only when the historical fact of the fall of Adam and the resurrection of Christ are symbolically enacted within man's soul, only when the old Adam is replaced by the new Adam, Christ, only when the fleshly heart is abandoned for the spiritual heart—only then is reason illumined. Thus Franck is careful to qualify the role of illumined reason. It becomes capable of considering divine things *(Sein)* only when inspired by the spirit, the word of God.

Knowledge and Truth—Because eternal truth defies comprehension in worldly terms, man is limited by his existence in the realm of *Schein*, which consists of the imperfect, the temporal, and the relative. Nothing can represent God as He truly is. He is utterly beyond the grasp of rational comprehension or expression: "All that one may say of God has, as Dionysius says, no truth in it. . . ."[44] Yet, although God is incognizable by human intelligence, He is immediately present to the person illumined by the spirit. "When man is illumined by God, he recognizes God, for he then recognizes God within himself."[45]

The Source of Knowledge—If only the presence of the spirit makes knowledge of God possible, then it naturally follows that Franck should reject worldly knowledge *(Wissen)* and Scripture *(Schrift)* as sources *per se* of the knowledge of God. Insofar as *Wissen* and *Schrift* are separate from the spirit of God, they are not only fruitless as sources of religious knowledge, but are actually mislead-

40 See *Weimar Ausgabe*, XXXVI (1942), line 36; XL 1, 204, line 26; XL 1, 447, line 15.
41 *Paradoxa* 119 f.
42 *Paradoxa*, Preface, p. 11.
43 Hegler, *op. cit.*, p. 115. See *Paradoxa* 248.
44 *Paradoxa* 1, p. 15.
45 Karl Klemm, *Das Paradoxon als Ausdrucksform der spekulativen Mystik Sebastian Francks* (Leipzig, 1937), p. 68.

ing. As a function of the outer man *Wissen* belongs to the realm of *Schein,* in which at best only a disorted picture of reality is given. To a considerable degree, the connotations of worldly knowledge and understanding *(Verstand)* overlap in Franck's thought. As a superficial human function neither worldly knowledge nor understanding is compatible with belief.[46] Yet, like understanding, worldly knowledge is not irremediably worthless. "He who does not know God knows nothing."[47] Here Franck refers to worldly knowledge as illumined, much as he allows illumined reason a place in religious experience. Even when applied to Scripture, worldly knowledge as merely mechanical understanding cannot yield knowledge of God. An exhaustive study of the letter of Scripture leads to only a loveless, ungodly worldly knowledge of God,[48] even though such study may result in great learning.

What, then, is the source of religious knowledge, especially of knowledge of God? The answer to this question is found in Franck's idea of the indwelling word. Man knows God only insofar as God dwells within man because God is known only by God. That is, God is known only through His presence in man, which is the Holy Spirit within, the indwelling word.[49] Therefore knowledge of God results only from man's immediate experience of God and is equivalent to knowledge about God. But if knowledge of God and knowledge about God are equivalent, then it becomes impossible for man truly to describe God, who is known only through ineffable experience. Moreover, the same point applies to all knowledge. Knowledge of truth, knowledge of reality and knowledge of God all are to be subsumed espistemologically under knowledge of *Sein* as opposed to knowledge of *Schein.* And the source of knowledge of *Sein* is "soul," man's existential situation as he is grasped by God. The danger of modernizing Franck must be noted here. The idea that God grasps man must be qualified slightly in that it does not necessarily refer to the sudden establishment of a point of contact, but may also refer to gradual conversion.

The question now arises: How is such knowledge stimulated? Does man play a completely passive role and merely wait for the divine self-disclosure? Franck will not admit that man is wholly inactive. On the contrary, man has a significant role to play before

46 *Paradoxa* 238, p. 280.

47 *Paradoxa* 91, p. 123.

48 *Paradoxa* 7, p. 21.

49 *Ibid.* Thus knowledge of God and knowledge of self are bound togeher. Cf. Hegler, *op. cit.,* p. 102, where Franck's *Die Guldin Arch,* "Vorrede," 3b, 42, is quoted. But see *Paradoxa* 64, p. 93.

he is capable of knowing God. Man must love. "Love! Then you have known and kept God and His word, Christ."[50]

Still it is not clear what Franck means when he claims that love or the indwelling word is the path to knowledge of God. The key here is Franck's understanding of experience *(Erfahrung)*, which, he believed, underlies all genuine religious knowledge. Although externals such as the reading of Scripture and listening to homilies may have some value, ultimately the experience of the word occurs only within the depths of the individual. Such intimately personal experience cannot be subjected to discussion or analysis because such an approach would destroy the essential subjectivity of the experience.[51]

When man has awakened to God within himself, Scripture, God's activity in history and all natural existence reveal truth to him.[52] If this is so, then Christ becomes a source of religious knowledge in two ways. He is an example as well as the word dwelling within the individual. Historically Christ was God in the flesh, both spirit *(Geist)* and flesh *(Fleisch)*, the one who overcame the split of *Schein* and *Sein* and who now leads man to God. Christ "has laid out for us a crossroad to the Father."[53] But Christ is more a witness to the truth than a teacher of it. Such an attitude reflects Franck's concern for experience *(Erfahren)* as opposed to teaching *(Lehren)*.

The Criterion of Religious Knowledge—The very motto of *Paradoxa* indicates Franck's concern for a criterion of knowledge-claims in religion and also suggests the criterion Franck found. "If anyone is spiritual, let him judge what I say. Quench not the spirit, despise not prophesyings, test all things and hold fast that which is good."[54] Spirit is for Franck not only the source of religious knowledge but also its criterion. The experience of God directly implies the intuitive knowledge of God. In short, if Franck's religious epistemology were to be labeled, perhaps "intuitionism" would be the most descriptive term to use.

The motive power of Franck's intuitionism lies in his belief that spirit, the word of God, is the ultimate criterion.[55] Reason or love may be employed sporadically as intermediate criteria, but ultimately spirit must prevail. Thus in the foreword to his transla-

50 *Paradoxa* 157, p. 195.

51 Cf. *Paradoxa* 220-26, p. 259, "Daher ist die Theologie und der Glaube mehr eine Erfahrung, als eine Kunst von aussen gelehrt."

52 Franck, *Chronica*, "Vorred."

53 *Paradoxa* 109-14, p. 148.

54 *Paradoxa*, title page. Franck quoted his first sentence from I Cor. 14:37; his second from I Thess. 5:19-21.

55 *Paradoxa*, p. 7. ". . . der sieben Geist, Sinn, Auslegung und Verstand ist allein gleich Gottes Wort, also allein die Probe der Geister." Cf. *Paradoxa* 220-26, p. 264.

tion of Althamer's *Diallage* Franck wrote that the conditions for true understanding of Scripture are twofold: (1) Scripture must be approached with a humble heart, and (2) reason must bow to the spirit, which alone can expound Scripture.[56] As for love as a criterion, Franck wrote: "Love has no law, but is itself the law. Therefore whatever is love is good and right."[57] However, the proposition that "whatever is love is good" cannot validly be transposed to read that "whatever is good is love," which would be necessary if love were to be the final criterion. Franck implicitly admits the secondary place of love as a criterion when, placing faith above love, he wrote: "Faith does not regard love, but clings to its God."[58] It seems that Franck refuses to allow love an ultimate position because love is primarily the activity of man, whereas faith is the activity of the spirit of God within man. Without a doubt, for Franck God must always be supreme.

But how does one know that what is felt is actually the word of God? Franck answers that false conviction would fail to elicit the unreserved assent of the heart. True inner conviction is accompanied by even greater certainty than sense experience. Thus conscience (*Gewissen*) and certainty (*Gewissheit*) tend to be identified in Franck's thought.[59] If one truly believes, then one believes the truth. If the object of belief is not the truth, then one does not really believe.[60] Thus there is no answer as to why the word of God, the spirit, is authoritative. It is a matter of personal conviction which by its very nature offers a criterion definitive for and applicable by only those who believe. In this way Franck unites in his epistemology not only the human and the divine but also the theoretical and the practical, because the criterion is inseparable from belief and belief exists in deeds—as will be seen.

The word of God, the spirit, functions more as a formative power than as a theoretical norm. By the word the individual can test everything within himself but nothing in written or spoken discourse on specifically theological and doctrinal issues.[61] The word is a norm of faith, not of dogma; a norm with the practical purpose of establishing a life of faith, not with the theoretical purpose of undergirding a theological system; a norm not for thought but for life.

56 Kolbenheyer, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
57 *Paradoxa* 179-80, p. 218.
58 *Paradoxa* 179-80, p. 222. Cf. p. 223, "Der Glaube sieht auf Gott und kurzweg auf keine Liebe und kein Aergernis, die ihn in diesem Lauf (zu Gott) hindern wollen." "Gottes Wort, die Wahrheit und der Glaube gehen voran, denen die Liebe folgt und sich deren freut."
59 Hegler, *op. cit.*, p. 100.
60 *Paradoxa* 220-26, p. 264.
61 Hegler, *op. cit.*, pp. 102 f.

The Religio-Moral Life—In maintaining an intimate relation between spirit (*i.e.,* religious experience) and morality, Franck naturally emphasized the importance of works of faith, although he refused to align himself with the position that man is justified by works. The man of faith expresses in moral living a faith which results only from the inner presence, power and working of the word of God, who is in Himself both ultimate reality and ultimate good.[62] The true and the good, then, are united in God and in man insofar as the Spirit of God dwells within man.

The epistemological criterion, spirit, is therefore the axiological criterion as well; and neither is to be understood apart from the other. Works of themselves are not a criterion of the presence of the spirit, but they indicate to some extent the validity of religious knowledge-claims. Indeed, Franck even paraphrased James 2:17: "Faith without works is dead; indeed it is no faith."[63] This statement, though, is not to be interpreted as a surrender of faith to works, but rather as a claim that faith is in fact actualized in good works. Works are not the criterion of faith, but faith is the essence of good works. Elsewhere Franck wrote: "Faith makes one godly without works."[64] Basically Paradoxes 215 and 249 are not contradictory. Paradox 249 is a factual description of the way in which the man of faith acts; Paradox 215 is a theological description of the relation between the man of faith and God.[65] In summary, works cannot justify, nor do they prove that one is justified; but works of moral living follow naturally and essentially from justifying faith.

Franck further explicates his position by distinguishing between works of faith and works of "unfaith" *(Unglaube).* Any deed motivated by faith is acceptable to God; but no deed apart from faith possesses any value beyond the realm of *Schein,* which is axiologically nothing. Thus the axiological dichotomy between *Sein* and *Schein* is carried into the practical realm of everyday life. This is an example of Franck's attempt to unite axiology with ontology, the practical with the theoretical, and man with God.

Evaluation

Any evaluative analysis of Franck's thought should strive for the same impartiality and fairness which he practiced in dealing with other philosophical and theological positions. Perhaps because of the unsystematic nature of *Paradoxa,* Franck leaves some

62 *Paradoxa* 8, p. 23 and *Paradoxa* 9, p. 24.
63 *Paradoxa* 249, p. 289. Here Franck patently breaks with Luther's characterization of James as an "epistle of straw" (*Erlangen Ausgabe,* LXXIII, p. 115).
64 *Paradoxa* 215, p. 254.
65 Cf. *Paradoxa* 243-47a, pp. 285 ff., and *Paradoxa* 81, p. 102.
66 Cf. *Paradoxa* 18, pp. 42 f., and *Paradoxa* 187-89, p. 213.

questions in the mind of the reader, even allowing that *Paradoxa* was written not for scholars but for the common people.

If *Schein* is regarded as ontologically real although axiologically nothing (*i.e.*, disvalue), than the possibility of moral action within the realm of *Schein* may be allowed. Indeed, if *Schein* is disvalue, then moral action becomes a necessity for the man of faith. If, however, moral action be possible or necessary, what standard is to be applied? What constitutes a moral action? At this point Franck demonstrated great weakness. He suggested that New Testament ethics as understood spiritually and not literally set the pattern for moral living after the example of the life of Christ. Thus, although Franck's emphasis on the practical life helped him avoid the amorality of completely passive mysticism, he was forced to resort to *Geist* as the final criterion of morality.

What, then, is implied by Franck's repeated recourse to *Geist,* as the ultimate source and criterion of both morality and religious knowledge? In theology exclusive dependence on *Geist* leads to humanism because of its anthropocentric orientation. *Geist* may be the Spirit of God, but it is placed within a human context. In reading *Paradoxa* one almost feels that *Geist* is a human phenomenon.

Philosophically, when Franck offers *Geist* as the final epistemological criterion, he surrenders to personal relativism. What sort of verification is possible when the epistemological criterion is *Geist?* No means of verification exists except inner conviction, which, although commendable in religion, will not suffice for philosophy. The theory of religious knowledge appearing in Franck's *Paradoxa* is primarily theology rather than philosophy, but it is a humanistic theology flowing from the depths of personal conviction. In this respect Franck's humanism possesses a strong element of confessional theology and perhaps attains a greater degree of self-understanding than contemporary humanism, which doggedly attempts to remain exclusively anthropocentric.

Appendix: Life Dates for Sebastian Franck

1499	born in Donauwörth
1524	becomes a Roman Catholic priest in the bishopric of Augsburg after studying in Ingolstadt and Heidelberg (Dominikanerkolleg)
1527	becomes a Protestant minister
1528	translates Althamer's *Diallage*
	leaves ministry
	marries Ottilie Behaim
	pursues humanistic studies
1529	meets Schwenckfeld, Campanus, Servetus and others at Strasbourg
1530	*Türkenchronik*
1531	*Chronica, Zeytbuch und geschychtbibel*
1534	*Weltbuch*
1535	*Paradoxa*
1538	*Guldin Arch*
1541	*Deutsche Sprichwörter*
1542/3	death

ANABAPTISM IN WESTPHALIA

Cornelius Krahn*

The geographic boundaries of the territory called Westphalia have in the past been flexible and often changed according to the political and religious constellations of the day. Anabaptism in Westphalia has primarily become known in connection with the radical Münsterite Anabaptism. Less known is the fact that after the end of the Münsterite movement in 1535 Anabaptism survived in various cities and communities in Westphalia. These Anabaptists, commonly known as "Mennisten" or "Tibben," had very little or nothing in common with the radical Münsterites. At the time of the Reformation Westphalia had three bishoprics, Münster, Minden, and Paderborn, and the abbeys Korvey and Herford, which were religious territories subject directly to the emperor. Secular entities were Cleve and the Duchy of Westphalia. Many of the cities of the province enjoyed great freedom. These territorial conditions determined to a large extent the outcome of the denominational lines of the province, in accordance with the principle *cuius regio eius religio*. In 1947 the province of North Rhine-Westphalia was formed.

The Lutheran reform movement reached Westphalia, particularly the eastern parts, in the early days of the Reformation. In the western part in places like Jülich and Cleve the Reformed influences became more noticeable. In the Duchy of Westphalia the Reformation came to a stop when Hermann von Wied, Bishop of Cologne, abdicated in 1547. Philip of Hesse exerted considerable influence in some parts. In the city of Münster various forces paved the way for the Reformation, some coming from Luther, others from the Lower Rhine and the Netherlands until the city was converted into a radical Anabaptist "New Jerusalem" which was liquidated in 1535 by the Bishop of Münster, Franz von Waldeck. All Anabaptism, everywhere, even if it had nothing to do with the "New Jerusalem," had received a setback from which it never recuperated, particularly in Westphalia. Keller's three-volume work, *Die Gegenreformation in Westfalen und am Niederrhein,* is to a considerable extent a record of the heroic struggle for survival by peaceful Anabaptism in the province of Westphalia. The Reformed and the Lutheran churches were, of course, witnessing in a similar way. Yet Friedrich Brune finds the evangelical movement closely interwoven with Ana-

* Cornelius Krahn is editor of *Mennonite Life,* North Newton, Kansas. His article on Westphalia appeared in Vol. IV of *The Mennonite Encyclopedia.*

baptism, particularly in the beginning, and his book is therefore also to some extent a history of Anabaptism in the rural areas of Münster seen from a Lutheran point of view.

1. *After "Münster."* In the city of Münster, Catholicism was fully restored after 1535, but Philip of Hesse insisted that at least one or two evangelical ministers be permitted to preach. Anabaptists, of course, were not permitted in the city. Münster, however, had lost the political, intellectual, and religious liberties it had enjoyed under the guilds which were now forbidden. In the surrounding towns and communities of Ahlen, Warendorf, Dülmen, Coesfeld, Ahaus, Vreden, Bocholt, Borken, and Freckenhorst, not only Protestantism but also Anabaptist congregations survived at places for a century.

In Warendorf, where Anabaptism found entry in 1534, one of the Anabaptist preachers was Johann Klopreis. More than fifty persons were baptized here. The city council was sympathetic toward Anabaptism until Franz von Waldeck interfered. The monastery Freckenhorst near Warendorf, which became Protestant in 1532, was an Anabaptist stronghold. In Coesfeld Anabaptism was established in 1534. Some followers went to Münster. In Dülmen the evangelical movement and Anabaptism were started through the preaching of Bernhard Rothmann. Two ministers from Münster were invited to promote the preaching of the Gospel there but were stopped by the bishop. In Vreden there were "several sects" who met outside the ciy in the barns and groves and practiced "their unusual baptism."

Bocholt also had special significance for the Anabaptists: a meeting of the surviving groups took place in 1536 in which David Joris seems to have been dominant. Adam Pastor, for a while a co-worker of Menno Simons, came from "Dorpen" in Wesphalia, evidently the village of Dörpen on the Ems in the northern part in the bishopric of Münster. On Menno Simons' journey from East Friesland to Cologne in 1545 and also when he returned to Lübeck in 1546 he may have passed through Westphalia.

2. *Cleve-Mark.* The persistence of the Anabaptists in Cleve and Mark is verified by the edicts issued by Count Wilhelm to his officers. On March 9, 1560, he gave detailed instructions as to the techniques to be used to win them back to the church. On June 10, 1560, the circulation of Anabaptist books was forbidden. On January 23, 1565, he addressed the mayor and the City Council of Soest demanding that they proclaim nontolerance of the Anabaptists. On July 28, 1576, he again issued an edict against the Anabaptists of Cleve-Mark, and on

August 16, 1576, another for the city of Soest. Again on September 24, 1580, he decreed "that Anabaptists, Calvinists, and other sects" should be forbidden and that their ministers should be imprisoned; strangers were to carry passports. On October 1, 1585, he again issued an edict against "Corner-baptists and Anabaptists, Sacramentists" and other sects, calling attention to the previously published edicts.

The third synod of Berg, January 3, 1590, states that Anabaptists were forbidden in the city of Elberfeld. On February 25, 1619, it was reported that the city of Sittard had a number of citizens who were Anabaptists, and on April 9, 1619, it was reported that "the Anabaptists are increasing" in the country of Löwenberg (the only place that has thus far been fully investigated).

3. *Bishopric of Münster.* The minutes of the Cathedral Chapter of Münster of 1596-1597 deal extensively with the Anabaptists at such places as Wüllen, Borken, and Vreden. Special attention was to be paid to the "Tibben" or Anabaptists who were penetrating cities here and there.

The Anabaptists of Bocholt, it was reported to the council of Münster on December 18, 1599, had not left the city on the specified date. On June 6, 1607, the council of Münster asked the officers of Bocholt, Ahaus, and other places to expel the Anabaptists immediately. On July 18, 1607, the Anabaptists writing "to the Council of Münster" referred to themselves as "All fellow believers, commonly known as Mennisten." They declared that they had nothing in common with the Münsterites of 1534; everybody could testify that they were quiet citizens; for this reason they requested that the edicts against them be annulled. A similar petition was sent to the Elector Ernst on August 18, 1607, and also on September 12, 1607, by citizens of Vreden. The negotiations concerning the exile of the Anabaptists at Ahaus, Bocholt, Vreden, and Borken continued.

In an edict of October 20, 1611, Anabaptists of Horstmar, Borkelo, Bevergern, Kloppenburg, Dülmen, Werne, Wolbeck, Sassenberg, and Stromberg are mentioned. From that date until June 19, 1612, numerous reports were issued on the subject. Places like Freckenhorst and Harsewinkel still had Anabaptists. A list of Anabaptists at Vreden and Ahaus was submitted on June 6, 20, and 22, 1612. On September 2, 1614, it was reported that the Anabaptists who had been exiled from Borken, Vreden, Bocholt, and Ahaus had returned. Negotiations concerning the Borken Anabaptists continued through October 24, 1622.

In 1612 Warendorf, Freckenhorst, Harsewinkel, Beelen, Bo-

cholt, Ahaus, Ottenstein, Wessum, Wüllen, Vreden, and other places still had some Anabaptists, particularly Vreden. Gradually, however, they had to leave these places, moving to Gronau, Hamm, Emmerich, Emden, Winterswijk, and Zutphen. However, during the official Catholic Church inspection of 1613-1616 numerous Anabaptists were still found in various places. Borken still had six or seven members who met regularly.

The various records give impressive information on the number and the steadfastness of the Anabaptists in Westphalia. However, they reveal little regarding their basic beliefs and practices. There is no trace of revolutionary activities. Brune, a Lutheran author, speaks very highly of them in his study of the Lutheran church, designating them as pious, industrious, and reliable citizens, highly honored by their neighbors. In Warendorf even a Catholic priest, Boethorn, is said to have sympathized with the Anabaptists in the early seventeenth century.

4. *Other Areas.* The *Martyrs' Mirror* reports under the year 1601 that Johann von Stein, Count of Wittgenstein, Lord of Homburg, executed four Anabaptists, Hybert op der Straaten, his wife Tyrnken, Pieter ten Hove, and Lysken von Linschoten. At the beginning of the eighteenth century there was a small Mennonite church in Hamm, gravure of Mark, and at the end of the century there was a small Amish Mennonite church at Petershagen near Minden.

5. *Later Period.* To what an extent, if any, the membership of the Mennonite Church of Gronau is of old Westphalia Anabaptist stock is not know. In any event this is the oldest Mennonite church in Westphalia. It was organized February 4, 1888, in Gronau, 32 miles northwest of Münster, by about twenty Mennonite families living in Gronau and Ahaus, where a large Mennonite industrial center has since developed.

Bibliography

Friedrich Brune, *Der Kampf um eine evangelische Kirche im Münsterland 1520-1802* (Witten, 1953); Robert Stupperich, *Das Münsterische Täufertum* (Münster, 1958); Ludwig Keller, *Die Gegenreformation in Westfalen und am Niederrhein,* 3 vv. (Leipzig, 1881-95); W. Risler, "Täufer im bergischen Amt Löwenburg, Siebengebirge," *Mennonitische Geschichtsblätter,* XII (1955), 6-21. In "Mennoniten in Duisburg," *Gesch.-Bl.,* May 1951, Risler presents an introduction and list of Mennonites of Duisburg. Ernst Crous gives a thorough modern report in "Auf Mennos Spuren am Niederrhein," *Der Mennonit,* VIII (1955), 187.

THE OTHERNESS OF THE CHURCH

JOHN HOWARD YODER*

That the "Constantinian era" is coming to an end has become one of the commonplaces of European social analysis. The fact that this breakdown has at some points been anticipated in North America (in the disestablishment of religion) and at other points is evolving differently here (rising church membership) hides from no one the fact that the framework of thought about the Church and the world, and their mutual interrelations, which for centuries was shared by all main-line Christian theologies, Protestant and Catholic, orthodox and rationalist, has fallen in the last two generations. The assumption that we live in a Christian world no longer holds.

The predominant theological response to this development has been to face the fact without evaluating it. Apart from a few clericalists and monarchists who are still working to restore the past, most thinkers simply make their peace with the new situation as they had with the old, assuming that the total process is of God's doing. For the first three centuries Christians were persecuted by the world; that was as it had to be. For over a millennium Christians ruled the world; that was as it should be. In the modern age the world again faces the Church as an autonomous, articulate, partly hostile party; that is as it should be. The Lord gave, the Lord takes away, blessed be the name of the Lord. The early Church was right in facing persecution courageously, the Church of the fourth century was right in making her peace with the world, the churches of the Middle Ages and the Reformation were right in leaning on the State; and now that that is no longer possible, the Church is again right in making the best of a bad deal.

But we can no longer so simply identify the course of history with Providence. We have learned that history reveals as much of Antichrist as of Christ. We are no longer sure that we are edging upwards at the top of a progression of which every preceding step must have been right for its time, since it has led us to this pinnacle. Above all we have learned to ask if it can really be the will of the Lord of history that His Church should be limping after history, always attempting to adapt to a new situation which she assumes to be providential, always a half-step behind in the effort to conform,

*John Howard Yoder is Administrative Assistant to the Secretary for Foreign Missions, Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities, Elkhart, Indiana. This article appeared originally in *Concern*, No. 8, May 1960 (Scottdale, Pa.).

being made by history instead of making history. We can therefore not say whether the deconstantinizing of the Church—be it in the form of possible disestablishment in East Germany, in that of defecting membership in Western Europe, or in the more complex forms taken by post-Christian paganism elsewhere—is a bane or a boon, until we have sought on a deeper level an understanding of the roots of modern secularism, of the *Mündigkeit,* the coming-of-age of the world. In this search we shall expect no new answers, but shall attempt to illuminate some old answers with a modified question.

We begin by seeking to isolate the concepts "Church" and "world" in their pre-Constantinian significance. "World" *(aion houtos* in Paul, *kosmos* in John) signifies in this connection not creation or nature or the universe, but rather the fallen form of the same, no longer conformed to the creative intent. The State, which for present purposes may be considered as typical for the world, belongs with the other *exousiai* in this realm. Over against this "world" the Church is visible; identified by baptism, discipline, morality and martyrdom. It is self-evident for the early centuries as a part of this visibility of the fellowship of disciples, that the Church's members do not normally belong in the service of the world and *a fortiori* in that of the pagan state.

But behind or above this visible dichotomy there is a believed unity. All evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, the Church believed that her Lord was also Lord over the world. The explicit paganism of State, art, economics, and learning did not keep her from confessing their subordination to Him who sitteth at the right hand of God. This belief in Christ's lordship over the *exousiai* enabled the Church, in and in spite of her distinctness from the world, to speak to the world in God's name, not only in evangelism, but in ethical judgment as well. She could take on a prophetic responsibility for civil ethics without baptizing the State or the statesman. The justice she demanded of the State was not Christian righteousness but human *justitia;* this she could demand from pagans, not because of any belief in a universal innate moral sense, but because of her faith in her Lord. Thus the visible distinctness of Church and world was not an insouciant irresponsibility; it was a particular, structurally appropriate way, and the most effective way, to be responsible.

This attitude was meaningful for the Church because she believed that the State was not the ultimately determinative force in history. She ascribed to the State at best a preservative function in

the midst of an essentially rebellious world, whereas the true sense of history was to be sought elsewhere, namely in the work of the Church. This high estimation of her own vocation explains both her visible distinctness from the world and the demands she addressed to it. The depth of her conviction that her own task was the most necessary enabled her to leave other functions in society to pagans; her faith in Christ's lordship enabled her to do so without feeling that she was abandoning them to Satan.

It follows from the "already, but not yet" nature of Christ's lordship over the powers that there is no one tangible, definable quantity which we can call "world." The *aion houtos* is at the same time chaos and a kingdom. The "world" of politics, the "world" of economics, the "world" of the theater, the "world" of sports, the under-"world" and a host of others—each is a demonic blend of order and revolt. The world "as such" has no intrinsic ontological dignity. It is creaturely order in the state of rebellion; rebellion is, however, for the creature estrangement from what it "really is"; therefore we cannot ask what the world "really is," somehow "in itself." This observation is borne out by the New Testament's use of a multiplicity of terms, most of them in the plural, when speaking of the world. All that the Powers have in common is their revolt, and revolt is not a principle of unity. Since the Prince of the Power of the Air is a liar from the beginning, he cannot even lie consistently. Only the lordship of Christ holds this chaos of idolatrous "worlds" together.

We have seen that for the early Church, Church and world were visibly distinct, yet affirmed in faith to have one and the same Lord. This pair of affirmations is what the so-called Constantinian transformation changes (I here use the name of Constantine merely as a label for this transformation, which began before A.D. 200 and took over 200 years; the use of his name does not mean an evaluation of his person or work). The most pertinent fact about the new state of things after Constantine and Augustine is not that Christians were no longer persecuted and began to be privileged, nor that emperors built churches and presided over ecumenical deliberations about the Trinity; what matters is that the two visible realities, Church and world, were fused. There is no longer anything to call "world"; State, economy, art, rhetoric, superstition and war have all been baptized.

It is not always recognized in what structural connection this change, in itself self-evident, stands with a new distinction which now arose. It was perfectly clear to men like Augustine that the

world had not become Christian through its compulsory baptism. There therefore sprang up the doctrine of the invisibility of the true Church, in order to permit the affirmation that on some level somewhere the difference between belief and unbelief, i.e., between Church and world, still existed. But this distinction had become invisible, like faith itself. Previously Christians had known as a fact of experience that the Church existed, but had to believe against appearances that Christ ruled over the world. After Constantine one knew as a fact of experience that Christ was ruling over the world, but had to believe against the evidence that there existed a believing Church. Thus the order of redemption was subordinated to that of preservation, and the Christian hope turned inside out.

The practical outworkings of this reversal were unavoidable. Since the Church has been filled with people in whom repentance and faith, the presuppositions of discipleship, are absent, the ethical requirements set by the Church must be adapted to the achievement level of respectable unbelief. Yet a more significant reason for moral dilution lies in the other direction. The statesman, who a century earlier would have been proud to declare that his profession was unchristian by nature, now wants to be told the opposite. What he does is the same as before, if not worse. Yet since there are no more heathen to do the work (correction: of course there are heathen; everyone knows with Augustine that most of the population is unbelieving, but unbelief has become invisible, like the Church), since there are no more confessing heathen, every profession must be declared Christian. Since Christian norms for the exercise of some professions are difficult to find, the norms of pagan *justitia* will be declared to define the content of Christian love. The autonomy of the State and of the other realms of culture is not brought concretely under the lordship of Christ, with the total revision of form and content which that would involve; it has been baptized while retaining its former content. An excellent example is Ambrose's rephrasing of Cicero's political ethics.

And yet the medieval Church maintained significant elements of otherness in structure as in piety, which are generally underestimated. When under the influence of men like Troeltsch we speak of the "medieval synthesis" and of a fusion of Church and world such that the salt had lost *all* its savor, the risk of caricature is great. Whatever was wrong with the basic confusion we have just described, the Church in the Middle Ages retained her consciousness of her distinctness from the world. The higher level of morality asked of the clergy, the international character of the hierarchy, the visibility of

the hierarchy in opposition to the princes, the gradual moral education of barbarians into monogamy and legality, foreign missions, apocalypticism and mysticism—all of these preserved an awareness, however distorted and polluted, of the strangeness of God's people in a rebellious world. Will the Reformation unearth and fan into new flame these smoldering coals, or will it bury them for good?

Despite many insights and initiatives which could have led in another direction, the Reformation, deciding between 1522 and 1525 in favor of political conservatism, decided at the same time not to challenge the Constantinian compromise. The Reformers knew very well of the "Fall of the Church"; but they dated this fall not in the fourth century but rather in the sixth and seventh. They did not see that the signs of fallenness to which they objected—papacy, Pelagianism, hagiolatry, sacramentalism—were largely fruits of the earlier confusion of Church and world.

For this reason there remains a fundamental inconsistency in the work of the Reformers. They decided in favor of the Middle Ages. They wanted nothing other than the renewal and purification of the *Corpus Christianum*. And yet they were driven, for reasons partly of tactics, partly of principle, to shatter that unity which they sought to restore. We have already noted that the hierarchy, the higher ethical commitment of the orders, the missionary and international character of the Roman Church, had preserved, even though in a distorted form, a residual awareness of the visible otherness of the Church. All of these dimensions of specificity were abandoned by the Reformation.

In the face of monasticism the Reformation affirmed the ethical value of the secular vocation. Through the imprecision of their terms this affirmation, right in itself, amounted to the claim, as wrong as the other was right, that every calling is its own norm, thereby heightening immeasurably (and unintentionally) the autonomy of the several realms of culture. Proper behavior in a given vocation is decided not by Christ but by the inherent norms of the vocation itself, known by reason, from creation, despite the Fall. The Reformers did not *intend* thereby to secularize the vocations and declare the order of creation independent of Christ; this is demonstrated by their continued efforts to give instructions to statesmen and by their claim that certain professions are unchristian (not those of prince, mercenary, and hangman, but those of monk, usurer, and prostitute); nevertheless the autonomy of state and vocation was mightily furthered by what they said, so that even today many Ger-

man Lutherans will argue that faithfulness to Luther demands that they let the State be master in its own house.

When the Church of the fourth century wished to honor Constantine, she interpreted him in the light of her eschatology. For Eusebius the Christian *Imperator* stood immediately under *Christos Pantokrator;* the State was unequivocally in the realm of redemption. The Reformation, however, placed the State in the realm of creation. Theoretically this meant decreasing the State's dignity; practically it meant increasing its autonomy. The prince in the sixteenth century is a Christian, the noblest and most honored member of the Church; but the work he does as prince is a purely rational one, finding its norms not in Christ but in the divinely fixed structure of society; it is a work a reasonable Turk could do as well.

Further: the Reformers did not call on the State abstractly, on the State as such, or on the State universal (Charles V), but on the territorial State—on the Elector of Saxony and Milords of Zürich—to carry through the Reformation. The territorial State was thereby loosed from the network of imponderable political and ecclesiastical forces and counterforces which in their complex entirety had formed and held together the *Corpus Christianum,* and given an immediate, unequivocal, uncontrollable divine imperative, subject to no higher earthly authority. Previously political action in God's name had been possible only in the name of the Church Universal; now religiously motivated political struggle is possible between Christian peoples. The Thirty Years' War was the last crusade—on both sides.

The conviction that the center of the meaning of history is in the work of the Church, which had been central in the pre-Constantinian Church and remained half alive in the Middle Ages, is now expressly rejected. The prince is not only a Christian, not only a prominent Christian; he is now the bishop. True faith and the true Church being invisible, the only valid aims of innerworldly effort are those which take the total secular society of a given area as the object of responsibility. The prince wields not only the sword, but all other powers as well. The Church confesses in deed and sometimes in word that not she, but the State, has the last word and incarnates the ultimate values in God's work in the world. What is called "Church" is an administrative branch of the State on the same level with the Army or the Post Office. Church discipline is applied by the civil courts and police. It is assumed that there is nothing wrong with this since the true Church, being invisible, is not affected.

It cannot be said that this turn of events was desired by the Reformers. Their uniform intention was a renewal of the visible, faithful body of believers. But the forces to which they appealed for support, namely the drives toward autonomy which exist in the State and the other realms of culture, were too strong to be controlled once they had been let loose.

In the context in which the Reformers made this decision there is much that we can understand and even approve of. Their faith in the all-powerful Word, which will not return void if it but be rightly preached, and their awareness of the divine ordination of the secular order, which were their conscious points of departure, were true in themselves. But they did not succeed in bringing up for examination the Constantinian synthesis itself. Thus their decisions, which in their minds were conservative, reveal themselves in a broader socio-historical perspectvie to have been inconsistent and revolutionary. The order of creation, in which they placed the State and the vocations, could with a turn of the hand become the deistic order of nature or the atheistic order of reason without any change in its inner structure. The right of the local government to administer the Church in the interest of the Reformation could become a right of the State to use the Church for its own purposes, and there was no court of appeal. The divine obligation of Zürich or Saxony to shatter the superstructure of the Holy Roman Empire could flip over —especially after the Thirty Years' War had discredited confessionalism as a moral imperative—and appear as the absolute *raison d'état*. It was therefore precisely the attempt of the Reformers to maintain the medieval ideal and to lay claim on the autonomous dynamics of State and profession which led to the secularization which defines the modern period. Fully to accept the Constantinian synthesis is to explode it. The Reformers created modern secularism; not, as the liberalism of two generations ago boasted, intentionally, by glorifying the individual, but unintentionally, through the inner contradictions of their conservatism.

The Constantinian approach has thereby shown itself to be incapable, not accidentally, but constitutionally, of making visible Christ's lordship over Church and world. The attempt to reverse the New Testament relationship of Church and world, making faith invisible and the Christianization of the world an historic achievement with the institutional forms, was undertaken in good faith, but has backfired, having had the sole effect of raising the autonomy of unbelief to a higher power. Islam, Marxism, secular Humanism and Fascism—in short, all the major adversaries of the Christian faith

in the Occident and the strongest adversaries in the Orient as well—are not nature- or culture-religions, but bastard faiths, all of them the progeny of Christianity's infidelity, the spiritual miscegenation involved in trying to make a culture-religion out of faith in Jesus Christ. As religious adversaries in our day, these hybrid faiths are more formidable than any of the pagan alternatives faced by Paul, by Francis Xavier, or by Livingstone. He who has refused to learn from the New Testament must now learn from history; the Church's responsibility to and for the world is first and always to be the Church. The short-circuited means used to "Christianize" "responsibly" the world in some easier way than by the gospel have had the effect of dechristianizing the Occident and demonizing paganism.

What then should be the path of the Church in our time? We must first of all confess—if we believe it—that the meaning of history lies not in the acquisition and defense of the culture and the freedoms of the West, not in the aggrandizement of material comforts and political sovereignty, but in the calling together of "men for God from every tribe and tongue and people and nation," a "people of His own who are zealous for good deeds." The basic theological issue is not between right and left, not between Bultmann and Barth, not between the sacramental and the prophetic emphases, nor between the Hebraic and Greek mentalities, but between those for whom the Church is a reality and those for whom she is the institutional reflection of the good and bad conscience, of the insights, the self-encouragement—in short, of the religion of a society.

If with the apostles we confess the Holy Spirit and the Church, we must further recognize that unbelief also incarnates itself. The "world" must return in our theology to the place that God's patience has given it in history. The "world" is neither all nature nor all humanity nor all "culture"; it is structured unbelief, rebellion taking with it a fragment of what should have been the Order of the Kingdom. It is not just an "attitude," as is supposed by the shallow interiorization of attempts to locate "worldliness" in the mind alone. Nor is it to be shallowly exteriorized and equated with certain catalogued forbidden leisure-time occupations. There are acts and institutions which are by their nature—and not solely by an accident of context or motivation—denials of faith in Christ.

The problem is also wrongly located when H. Richard Niebuhr sets up over against Christ a quantity named "culture" which one may then attempt to relate to Christ in a number of possible ways. In spite of the effectiveness of this scheme as a tool for classification and teaching, in spite of the erudition and sympathetic understand-

ing with which Niebuhr deals with the various possibilities, and in spite of the literary qualities which have won the book its broad circulation, it must be recognized that his fundamental Christ/culture polarity, and typology of possible ethical standards which he builds upon it, are at bottom unfair to history and unfruitful for ethics. The reason for this is the assumption that culture "as such," i.e., as distinct from Christ, is a tangible reality patient of being related consistently to "Christ" in one of the five typical ways. This is to attribute to the World that intrinsic ontological dignity which neither the New Testament nor history allows it to claim. We must affirm the reality of the world, but not by ascribing to it the right to the place it usurps.

The awareness of the visible reality of the world leads to two scandalous conclusions. The first is that Christian ethics is for Christians. Since Augustine this has been denied; the first criterion for an ethical ideal for laymen is its generalizability. From Kant's rigorous formulation of this criterion to the lay application in questions like, "What would happen if we were all pacifists like you?" the presupposition is universal that the right will have to apply as a simple performable possibility for a whole society. Thus the choice is between demanding of everyone a level of obedience and selflessness which only faith and forgiveness make meaningful (the puritan alternative), and lowering the requirements for everyone to the level where faith and forgiveness will not be needed (the medieval alternative). This dilemma is *not* part of the historical situation; it is an artificial construction springing from a failure to recognize the reality of the world.

The second scandalous conclusion is that there may well be certain functions in a given society which that society in its unbelief considers necessary, and which the unbelief renders necessary, in which Christians will not be called to participate. This was self-evident in the early Christian view of the State; that it had to be rejected later becomes less and less self-evident the longer we live and learn.

This view of the Church commends itself exegetically and theologically. Contrary to the opposing view, it refuses to accept pragmatic grounds for deciding how Christians should relate themselves to the world. And yet after saying this we observe that this Biblical approach is in fact the most effective. The moral renewal of England in the eighteenth century was the fruit not of the Anglican establishment but of the Wesleyan revival. The Christianization of Germanic Europe in the Middle Ages was not achieved by the State Church

structure, with an incompetent priest in every village and an incontinent Christian on every throne, but by the orders, with the voluntaristic base, the demanding discipline, the mobility, and the selectivity as to tasks which characterize the Free-Church pattern. What moral tone there is in today's Germany is due not to the State-allied Church and the Church-allied political parties, but to the bootleg Bruderschaften of the Barmen confession.

This makes it clear that the current vogue of the phrase "responsible society" in ecumenical circles is a most irresponsible use of terms. Even if we let pass the intentional ambiguity which makes society both the subject and the object of the responsibility, and the further confusion caused by the hypostatising of "society," there remains a fundamental misdefinition, furthered by a misreading of socio-ethical history. It continues to work with the Constantinian formulation of the problem, as if the alternatives were "responsibility" and "withdrawal." The body of thought being disseminated under this slogan is a translation into modern terms of the two ancient axioms: that the most effective way for the Church to be responsible for society is for her to lose her visible specificity while leavening the lump; and that each vocation bears in itself adequately knowable inherent norms. Thus we are invited to repeat the mistake of the Reformation, and that just as the time when the younger churches, themselves in an essentially pre-Constantinian position, need to be helped to think in other terms than those of the *Corpus-Christianum* framework which has already dechristianized Europe.

Christ's victory over the world is to be dated not A.D. 311 or 313 but A.D. 29 or 30. That Church will partake most truly of His triumph which follows Him most faithfully in that warfare whose weapons are not carnal but mighty. She will be most effective when she abandons effectiveness and intelligence for the foolish weakness of the Cross in which are the wisdom and the power of God. She will be most deeply and lastingly responsible for those in the valley of the shadow if she is the city set on the hill. The true Church is the free Church.

How then do we face deconstantinization? If we meet it as just another turn of the inscrutable screw of providence, just one more chance to state the Constantinian position in new terms, then the judgment which has already begun will sweep us along in the collapse of the culture for which we boast that we are responsible. But if we have an ear to hear what the Spirit says to the Churches, if we let ourselves be led out of the inferiority complex which the theologies of the Reformation have thus far imposed on Free Church

thought, if we discover as brethren in a common cause the catacomb churches of East Germany and the Bruderschaften of West Germany, if we puncture the "American dream" and discover that even in the land of the God-trusting Post Office and the Bible-believing chaplaincy we are in the same essentially missionary situation, the same minority status as the Church in Ceylon or Colombia; if we believe that the Free Church, and not the free world, is the primary bearer of God's banner, the fullness of Him who fills all in all, if we face deconstantinization not as just another dirty trick of destiny but as the overdue providential unveiling of a pernicious error; then it may be given to us, even in the twentieth century, to be the Church. For what more could we ask?

(Continued from page 250)

speaks thus truly "in the Name of Christ," for the building of His people in the world.

FEW STUDIES OF LEADERS OF THE AMISH MENNONITES IN AMERICA IN THE NINEteenth century have been published, largely because of the lack of source material, but also because nineteenth-cntury Mennonites, embedded in a predominantly rural environment, moved in a relatively isolated framework, often remote from the main currents of American life. Rural Amish Mennonite communities west of the Mississippi were even more isolated than their sister communities farther east. Their leaders were therfore largly local, not well-known in the larger brotherhood. In spite of this, some unique and very attractiv personalities were found among them. Such was Bishop Sebastian Gerig of the Alsatian Amish community of southeastern Iowa. In the absence of written sources, his biographer, Melvin Gingerich, has depended largely on personal reminiscences and anecdotes. The resultant study is one of genuine human interest, with its picture of an unusually able leader of men and an outstandingly beloved and influential pastor.

SEBASTIAN GERIG (1838-1924): HIS LIFE AND TIMES

MELVIN GINGERICH*

Among the most influential members of the Western District Amish Mennonite Conference, which met annually from 1890 through 1920, was Sebastian Gerig, bishop of the Sugar Creek Amish Mennonite Church, Wayland, Iowa. Of the thirty-one sessions of the conference, Gerig attended twenty-four annual meetings. He missed only one session from 1893 to 1915 and was present at every session from 1897 through 1915. After being absent during the war years, he attended one more meeting, the final session, in 1920. During the thirty-one years, he served eight times as moderator or assistant moderator of the conference, which is a fairly large number considering the fact that the office was rotated much of the time. On seven occasions he preached the annual conference sermon. It is likely that no other member had as good a record in attendance and in active participation at the thirty-one annual sessions as had Gerig. Furthermore, his congregation served as the host church for the conference on four different occasions, in 1893, 1898, 1903, and 1912.[1]

Sebastian Gerig was born in Pfastatt, Alsace, on May 27, 1838, the son of Jakob and Elizabeth (Zimmerman) Gerig. Jakob was born in 1794, in Markirch, Alsace, and died in 1850 in Burtzviller near Mulhouse. Elizabeth Zimmerman was born near Strasbourg in 1796 and died in Pfastatt near Mulhouse in 1848, where she is buried. The children of this union were Elizabeth Gerig Meyer (1817-1905), Christian (1819-74), Peter (1821-21), Jacob (1824-55), Barbara (1826-63), Katherine Gerig Koebel (1829-1907), Mary Gerig Roth (1834-94), Sebastian (1838-1924), and Benjamin (1842-1913).[2] Sebastian was therefore the next to the youngest child and only around ten years old when his mother died, and twelve when his father died.

*Melvin Gingerich is archivist of the Archives of the Mennonite Church, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.

1 The printed minutes of the annual meetings of these conferences are located in the Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana. The minutes contain a list of attendants for every year except 1917. The above attendance record assumes, perhaps incorrectly, that Gerig was not present in 1917 because he was not present in 1916, 1918, and 1919.

2 "Autobiography of Jacob G. Meyer and Genealogy of the Meyer and Gerig Families," a manuscript in the Archives of the Mennonite Church, Goshen, Indiana. Sebastian Gerig's younger brother Benjamin migrated to America in 1860 and settled in Wayne County, Ohio. Here he became a bishop in the Amish Mennonite church and in time became active in the Western District A. M. Conference, attending his first session in 1896. He was the father of Bishop Jacob Gerig of Smithville, Ohio. The oldest sister, Elizabeth, married Johann Jacob Meyer. They were the grandparents of Dr. Jacob C. Meyer, former Professor of History at Western Reserve University. Sebastian's sister Mary and her husband, Joseph Roth, migrated to Wayne County, Ohio. They were the great-grandparents of Russell Krabill, pastor of the North Goshen Mennonite Church, Goshen, Indiana, as well as the grandparents of Mrs. C. L. Graber and Mrs. Melvin Gingerich of Goshen, Indiana.

After the death of his mother he made his home with his oldest sister, Mrs. Johann Jacob Meyer, until he came to America.

Little is known about Sebastian's boyhood days in Alsace. According to tradition, his mother had come from a moderately wealthy family, but this did not make life easy for the lad. At the age of nine he began delivering bread every morning. After he had earned sufficient money in America, he sent funds to his younger brother Benjamin in Europe to enable him to come to the United States in 1860. Sebastian was baptized as a youth in the Amish Mennonite church of Alsace. After World War I, he was shown a recent picture of the Mennonite Church at Pulversheim,[3] Upper Alsace, which he recognized immediately as the church in which he had been baptized. He remembered in which corner of the church he used to sit. At that time there was no Mennonite church in Pfastatt and so the family attended services in nearby Pulversheim.[4]

Gerig used to relate that as a lad he stood on a wall and watched Napoleon III ride by at the time he took over power in that area, likely in 1851. In order to escape compulsory service in Napoleon's army, Gerig emigrated to Canada in his seventeenth year in 1856. As his eighteenth birthday was in May of that year, the date of his departure from France must have been between January and May of 1856. His first destination was Baden, Ontario, where he spent his first night with his friend Joseph Schlegel, with whom he was to be closely identified for many decades.

After spending a few weeks in Canada, he went to Davis County, Iowa, where an Amish Mennonite community had been established in 1854. Among the early settlers in the Iowa community were Ontario Amish Mennonite families. The Schlegel family from Ontario soon located in Davis County. Probably this interest of Ontario Amish Mennonites in Davis County influenced Gerig to locate there, where he spent his first years in the United States.[5]

3 See "Pulversheim," in *Mennonite Encyclopedia* (hereafter cited as *ME*), IV, 232.

4 According to the *ME*, the members met in each other's homes until 1856, when a former inn was purchased and transformed into a meetinghouse. In that year Gerig reached eighteen and so if he was baptized in this house, he was likely seventeen years of age at the time of his baptism. Olive Wyse is perhaps correct in her biography of Gerig in the *ME*, in which she states that he was baptized at the age of seventeen and then came to America in 1856. The obituary in the *Gospel Herald* (April 3, 1924), p. 63, states that he was baptized at the age of fourteen.

5 The *ME* (IV, 840) declares that Gerig spent six years in Davis and Lee counties, Iowa, while his obituary in the *Gospel Herald* speaks only of six years in Davis County. John W. Gingerich, Kalona, Iowa, however, supplies a note indicating that Gerig probably lived in Lee County. He writes, "In the fall of 1909 Sebastian Gerig was visiting my father (Henry F. Gingerich). While looking over the new barn that was recently built, Sebastian noticed we had a litter carrier made by the Louden Mfg. Co. of Fairfield, Iowa. Wm. Louden, the founder, was the inventor of the overhead automatic hay carrier and track used everywhere. When Sebastian was a young man and working in Lee County, Iowa, he worked with Wm. Louden as he was trying out his new hay carrier. He said the weather was so hot that he and Louden were the only ones who could work in the extreme heat, as they were both slender built young men. Some of the other men could not stand the extreme heat."

After six years in Iowa, Gerig lived in Wayne County, Ohio, for approximately two years, likely from 1862 to 1864. This move may have been occasioned by the fact that his younger brother Benjamin had moved to Wayne County in 1860. From Ohio he returned to Henry County, Iowa, where an Amish Mennonite community had been established in the late 1840's and a church organized in 1852 or 1853. In Henry County Gerig was married to Magdalena Goldsmith on September 11, 1864. Magdalena, the youngest child of Bishop Joseph Goldsmith, had moved to Henry County from Lee County with her parents in the 1850's. Goldsmith was the leader of the Henry County Amish Mennonite church, as he had earlier been of the Lee County church. Goldsmith was born near Markirch, Alsace, in 1796, landed in Philadelphia in 1819, and moved to Ontario in 1824. In that year he was ordained to the office of minister, thus becoming one of the pioneer Amish preachers of Canada. In 1831 the family moved to Butler County, Ohio, where seven years later he was ordained to the office of bishop by his uncle Bishop Benedict King. In 1846 the family moved to Lee County, Iowa, where he immediately became the leader of the Amish congregation. From his Lee County home, Goldsmith occasionally ministered to the Amish churches in Henry and Johnson counties. In 1855 or perhaps 1857 he moved to Henry County where he became the first preacher of the Amish community and the bishop of the congregation. In 1867 Goldsmith ordained Joseph Schlegel to assist him in the ministry and then because Goldsmith's failing health made it impossible for him to perform his duties as a bishop, he ordained Schlegel to that office in 1868.

As additional ministerial help was again needed in the Henry County church, Sebastian Gerig was ordained preacher in 1869. The story of his ordination is typical of many others in Amish congregations. Young men did not aspire to the office of minister, for it was an assignment with grave responsibilities bringing few earthly compensations. When Gerig was informed that he had been chosen for the office, he mounted his horse to return to his home, but Bishop Schlegel went out, talked to his friend, and finally persuaded him to accept the ordination. Thus began a rich ministry of over half a century.

Bishop Joseph Goldsmith[6] lived until 1876 and thus for a period of approximately seven years Gerig had the advantage of the counsel of his father-in-law. During those same years he had the help of his

6 See Melvin Gingerich, *The Mennonites in Iowa* (Iowa City, 1939). Also John W. Gingerich, *Joseph Goldsmith (1796-1876) and His Descendants* (Kalona, Iowa, 1955).

friend Bishop Joseph Schlegel, who was born near Mulhouse in 1837, migrated to Ontario as a youth and a few years later moved to Davis County, Iowa, before settling in Henry County, where he was ordained as was stated above. In 1879 he moved to Milford, Nebraska, where he resided until his death in 1913. Along with Gerig, Schlegel was an important figure in the Western District Amish Mennonite Conference. He was its first moderator and served as moderator or assistant moderator ten times between 1890 and 1904. He attended at least nineteen sessions between 1890 and 1912, preached eight conference sermons, and was appointed to important committees. He was known as a forceful speaker and his ability as a mediator was widely recognized.[7] When Schlegel moved to Nebraska in 1879 Gerig was ordained to take his place as the bishop of the Sugar Creek Amish Mennonite Church, the name given to the Henry County congregation, in which the two men had been co-laborers for the previous ten years.

Like other preachers ordained in the days of an untrained ministry in the Amish Mennonite Church, Gerig was not chosen because of his education in Bible schools but rather because of his character, personality, and talents. His formal education consisted of what he had learned in the elementary grades in Alsace; he was a self-taught man. His mother tongue was German and he recognized few English words when he came to America. He used to relate that one of the first English words he came to recognize was the word "capacity" appearing on freight cars. He always preached in German. In later years Gerig often expressed his wish that he had had a better education. A grandson wrote,

> Grandfather was pretty much a self-educated man. He read extensively. He made himself a special board for his armchair to support the heavy volumes which he studied in the early days of his ministry. Even in his last years he was well informed about the social and political problems of the day.

During World War I the local Defense Board in Henry County, Iowa, gave notice that there was to be no more German preaching in the Sugar Creek Amish Mennonite Church. They, however, conceded the point that the Scripture lesson could be read in German and that there could be German comments on the passage, as well as a German prayer. This concession was made likely in deference to Gerig as well as to the solid citizens of the community who were immigrants from Alsace and Switzerland and who had not yet gained

7 Melvin Gingerich, "Ten Leaders of the Western District Amish Mennonite Conference," *Mennonite Historical Bulletin,* October 1940. *ME,* IV, 460.

a good knowledge of the English language. Thereafter there often were services in which the German comments on the Scripture passages by Gerig were longer than the short English sermons which followed, delivered by preacher Simon Gingerich or Daniel Graber. Gerig was, however, not opposed to the use of the English language and earlier had advised that a young man who could preach in English should be ordained. Consequently Simon Gingerich was chosen by a majority vote of the congregation and was ordained April 19, 1908.

In his earlier preaching, Gerig generally built his sermon by making extended comments on a Bible passage, but in later years he selected texts for the basis of his sermons. One of his favorite verses when he became older was "So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom." He was always prompt in bringing his sermons to a close and never belabored a point. Never a deep theologian, his remarks were generally practical applications of Bible teachings. He was able to present his convictions in a kindly way so that his hearers knew what shortcomings he was referring to without being offended. His co-minister Simon Gingerich testified that Gerig never adversely criticized his sermons but that he did offer suggestions on how they could be improved. As a pastor Gerig was able to work effectively as an agent of reconciliation. On one occasion he was sent to effect a reconciliation between two women of the congregation. One refused to forgive until the other confessed having done wrong. He asked her if she ever prayed the Lord's Prayer and when she admitted that she did, he went on to show her what was involved in saying "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." The woman understood the point and was led to forgive the offender and the two became reconciled. He was always very sympathetic towards the young people of his church and they had a deep respect for him. His obituary called attention to the fact that "he was especially interested in the welfare of young people."

Gerig's first experience in a church conference came in 1873 when he attended the Amish Mennonite *Diener-Versammlung* (Ministers' Meeting) in Wayne County, Ohio. During the 1840's and 1850's the Amish churches in America were gradually drifting apart, with some rigidly retaining the old customs and traditions and others making changes. Matters of controversy included baptism in houses versus baptism in streams, the strict enforcement of the ban, services in meetinghouses versus in the homes, and the problem of simple clothing. The last of these sessions was held in 1878, the meetings coming to an end probably because they were

unable to bring together the differing groups. From that time on the Amish Mennonites in America were divided into three major groups. The most conservative group came to be known as the Old Order Amish. Most liberal were the Stuckey Amish Mennonites of Illinois, who later were known as the Central Conference of Mennonites. Occupying a middle position were those who called themselves simply the Amish Mennonites[8] and continued to be known by that term until recently.

It is with this middle group that Gerig's congregation was associated. In the very first meeting of the *Diener-Versammlung* Joseph Goldsmith had dared to raise the question of how strictly the ban was to be applied against those placed under church censure, thus probably indicative that his church favored liberalizing the practice. Both Goldsmith and Gerig were well accepted in the *Diener-Versammlung,* which perhaps indicated that their congregation represented a majority point of view and not the conservative position of those who favored the old order. In the very first session that Gerig attended, he gave his "testimony" following the conference sermon, thus adding his voice of approval. Later in this conference session he was called upon to close one of the meetings with an *Ermahnung* or words of exhortation, which the report summarizes in the following sentence: "Each hearer was admonished concerning obedience to God and the love that we should have for each other, about which the Saviour taught much, saying how we should walk in love, which is to be shown by our works, since we are to be rewarded according to the merit of our works." Later in the session, Gerig invited the conference to meet in Iowa the following year. The invitation was accepted, and so in 1876 the Amish Mennonite Ministers' Meeting was convened in John Conrad's barn in the north part of the settlement, in Washington County.

Following the demise of the *Diener-Versammlung* in 1878, the more progressive Amish Mennonite leaders met occasionally for counsel and fellowship. One such informal meeting was held in Illinois in about 1882.[9] A second meeting was held in 1883 in Cass County, Missouri, and a third one in Henry County, Iowa, in 1884. According to Hartzler and Kauffman the ministers present agreed that the wearing of hooks and eyes on men's coats should no longer be made a test of church fellowship. The above historians report that at this conference it was decided again to hold annual meetings,

8 Just when the term Amish Mennonite originated is not clear. The conference of 1862 was already known as the Ministers' Meeting of the Amish Mennonites.

9 J. S. Hartzler and Daniel Kauffman, *Mennonite Church History* (Scottdale, 1905), 306 ff.

but the writer has been unable to discover if this was carried into effect. It is a known fact that in 1887 the conference was held in the Sugar Creek Amish Mennonite meetinghouse.[10]

> On October 1, 2, and 3, the Conference of the Amish Mennonites of the Western States was held in the Sugar Creek meetinghouse. There were twenty ministers and deacons present from different states and everything passed off pleasantly and all the members worked together in a spirit of unity.[11]

The influence of Gerig in the conference is in part measured by the number of times his church was host to the sessions. The conference again met at the Sugar Creek meetinghouse, as was stated above, in 1893, 1898, 1903, and in 1912. Considering that by 1905 there were thirty-two churches in the conference, Sugar Creek had more than its proportion of meetings. Another indication of Gerig's influence in the conference is the fact that when in 1916 it divided its territory between Illinois and Colorado into five bishop districts, he was given charge of the Iowa-Minnesota district. This required regular visitation of the small churches that had no resident bishops. For many years Gerig visited these churches regularly.

Since the reports of the Western District Conference do not indicate who spoke on the different topics under discussion, it is impossible to decide what points of view were held by individual conference attendants. Nevertheless, it is possible to assess the spirit of these annual meetings. On the question of shunning those under the ban, which had been one of the chief matters of controversy in the sessions of the *Diener-Versammlung,* it was decided that each member should take such an attitude toward expelled members as he thinks the Scriptures require him to take. This was essentially the position of the Mennonite churches in contrast to the Old Order Amish practice. The Amish practice of congregational rule was, however, not abandoned. Although the new conference spoke conservatively on many issues, no attempt was made to pass binding legislation for the congregations. Hartzler and Kauffman explain,

> The first sessions of conference were marked for their extreme caution. On account of differences of opinion on vital questions, they hardly dared to make any general regulations. They were together, not to give voice or direction to church doctrine and work, but, as brethren in the Lord, endeavoring to promote a spirit of unity and good will, and seeking common ground upon which to unite for offensive warfare against the common enemy of souls.[12]

10 The Henry County congregation built its first meetinghouse in 1871.
11 *The Herald of Truth* (Elkhart, Ind.), Dec. 15, 1887.
12 Hartzler and Kauffman, *op. cit.,* 308.

It should also be pointed out that this attitude of avoiding conference regulations binding upon the congregations was partly a reaction against the Old Order Amish practice of having detailed church rules. As these brethren saw it, the policy of drawing up specific rules on such matters as the form of dress led only to strife and division. Here the position of Gerig was typical of the enlightened leadership of the conference. He often said that a church regulation that attempts to make a custom mandatory cannot be made permanent unless the issue is covered by direct Bible teaching. He was therefore opposed to strict rules on the style of clothing and favored only general teaching of the principles of simplicity and modesty.

In the late nineteenth century a movement against the wearing of neckties came into the Mennonite Church, probably as an influence from the Holiness churches, and so the necktie became an issue in many churches. Gerig remarked that he had been ordained wearing a necktie and saw no reason for discarding it later and so he wore one for many years. He also discarded hooks and eyes at an early date. Even before Bishop Schlegel left for Nebraska, the Sugar Creek church had decided to make hooks and eyes on men's coats no longer compulsory. Gerig wore a business suit, or on Sundays a longer frock coat until the early years of the twentieth century when because of pressure he finally adopted the Mennonite regulation coat, a coat buttoning up to the neck, similar to the one worn by Nehru of India. Even after this during the summer months he usually wore his business suit in the pulpit. A man of medium height, Gerig presented an attractive appearance with his well-groomed beard and his neat clothes.

When the issue of merging the Western District Amish Mennonite Conference with the district Mennonite conferences was being debated in 1920, some of the leaders of the Amish Mennonite group were very reluctant to make the change. This involved accepting an authoritative conference with legislative power and an end to the congregational system such as had prevailed in the Sugar Creek congregation, for instance. It involved also the acceptance of the stricter Mennonite rules in the area of dress. Gerig's daughters say that this transition to the Mennonite conference was the most difficult struggle of their father's entire life. In the Iowa area feelings ran so deeply on the issue that when the merger was effected the name adopted for the new organization was simply "The Iowa-Nebraska District Conference." Both "Amish" and "Mennonite" were dropped from the official title.

Gerig's moderately liberal position brought criticism upon him. One controversy involved the Johnson County, Iowa, churches. During the 1870's dissatisfaction began to arise in the Old Order Amish churches of Johnson County because preachers from more liberal churches visiting their friends in the community were not given the privilege of preaching. These began to meet separately for religious services. Bishop John K. Yoder of Wayne County, Ohio, suggested that they transfer their membership to the Sugar Creek congregation of Henry County. Some of the families did this in 1878 and 1879 and for some time attended services in Henry County. But the distance was too great to allow regular attendance; instead they had Sebastian Gerig hold services in their homes occasionally. Gerig, lover of peace that he was, did not do this willingly, realizing that it would cause ill feeling. Finally a committee of arbitration was chosen consisting of preachers from the churches of Henry and Johnson counties. It was decided that the Sugar Creek bishop could hold one more communion service for the dissatisfied Johnson County group, but after that they were to return to the Old Order churches, and the Johnson County ministers in turn were to fellowship with the Sugar Creek ministers. The agreement was not carried out and finally the dissident group organized what came to be the East Union church, near Kalona, which fellowshipped with the Gerig church.[13]

Another incident concerns the relationship between the Sugar Creek church and the near-by Eicher Amish Mennonite church. During the 1850's there was one congregation but two settlements under Biship Goldsmith's charge. One settlement centered around Trenton in Henry County. The other settlement lay from five to ten miles north in Marion Township, Washington County. In time two organizations were formed with Goldsmith in charge of both. A demand for a completely separate organization on the part of the Marion Township settlement led to the ordination of Benjamin Eicher in 1862 as leader of the Washington County brotherhood. Eicher, however, followed a more liberal course than did the Sugar Creek leaders, and so the two churches drifted apart. Following the *Diener-Versammlung* of 1874, Eicher's church followed an independent course. At one time Eicher became involved in a controversy that caused him to stop preaching temporarily. During this interval Sebastian Gerig was invited to fill Eicher's pulpit, which he did until the objections of one of his fellow ministers caused Gerig to discontinue the service. Gerig often remarked that he believed the

13 For a fuller treatment of this controversy see Melvin Gingerich, *The Mennonites in Iowa* (Iowa City, 1939), 133-37.

two churches could have been brought together again at this time had it not been for the objection to his preaching in the Eicher church. Eventually the Eicher congregation became a member of the General Conference Mennonite Church. Nevertheless there continued to be a measure of co-operation between the two congregations. When Benjamin Eicher died in 1893, Gerig participated in the funeral service. Gerig also preached occasionally for the Pulaski Amish Mennonite church, in Davis County, which followed a liberal course and finally joined the General Conference Mennonites. Gerig was preaching here on the day his son Samuel died, on March 30, 1878, and was not informed of the death until after his sermon had been delivered.

Gerig was fortunate in having as his fellow workers in the pulpit men of unusual ability. Reference has already been made to Joseph Goldsmith and Joseph Schlegel. Another man who made an outstanding contribution to Gerig's church was Stephen T. Miller, who was born in Holmes County, Ohio, in 1844. In 1877, Miller was ordained deacon in Wayne County, Ohio, but in 1878 he moved with his family to Henry County, Iowa. In the following year Gerig ordained Miller to the office of minister. Likely this was occasioned by the fact that earlier that year Schlegel had moved to Nebraska and more help was needed in the pulpit. That Miller was progressive in his views is proved by the fact that he was the leader in promoting a young people's meeting for the Sugar Creek church, an activity which was begun in 1893. He attended the early sessions of the Western District Amish Mennonite Conference, being present in 1890 and 1892. In 1892 Miller was appointed to the Mennonite Evangelizing Board of America; but in January 1893, on the way to a meeting of the Board in Elkhart County, Indiana, he was fatally injured in a train wreck. His funeral at the Sugar Creek church, in charge of C. Werey, Benjamin Eicher, and Sebastian Gerig, was largely attended. His obituary stated, "Bro. Miller was a devoted husband, a kind father, and he was loved and respected by his fellowmen."[14]

Daniel Graber was ordained on April 16, 1893, to take Miller's place as preacher. He had been active in the work of the Sunday school, which was begun at Sugar Creek in 1872, and was among its early superintendents, serving when only eighteen years of age. He was also active in the work of the Western District A. M. Conference, serving as its secretary for eleven years and treasurer for at least

14 *Herald of Truth*, Feb. 1, 1893, p. 53. Stephen Miller was the father of Dr. S. T. Miller, well-known physician of Elkhart, Indiana.

two years. For years he served on the local board of the Kansas City Mennonite Mission. His obituary states,

> He was a special friend of children. For years he conducted a children's service after the regular Sunday school hour. He was a lover of sacred song and much interested in better congregational singing. He conducted singing classes in the church and community. . . . He used the German language mostly in his preaching, but could also use the English fluently, which enabled him to be of great service to his church during the period of language transition.[15]

Another leader with whom Gerig was associated was his nephew Christian G. Gerig, who came to America with his parents in 1864, settling in Wayne County, Ohio. In 1876 Christian moved to Henry County, Iowa, becoming a member of the Sugar Creek congregation, where he was ordained to the office of deacon in 1887. Several years later Sebastian Gerig ordained him to the office of minister. In 1904 Christian with his family moved to Oregon. There he was ordained to the office of bishop. Sebastian Gerig was present for this occasion and participated in the ordination service.

Simon Gingerich was ordained preacher of the Sugar Creek church in 1908 to bring into the ministry one who could preach in the English language. In 1916 he was ordained bishop to succeed Gerig, who had reached the age of seventy-eight and wished to be relieved of the heavy work of the office. The two men continued to work together closely throughout Gerig's remaining years. Gingerich was an able preacher and gave active leadership to the congregation down to the time of his retirement.

Gerig's contributions were not limited to his church; his influence in the home and community were considerable. Daily family worship and prayers before and after each meal set the atmosphere of the home. He had his family participate in these devotional exercises by having them read from the Bible. His prayers were impromptu, not read from a prayerbook. His ten children who reached maturity became members of his church. His grandchildren are all active members of churches and three of them are in the ministry of the Mennonite Church.[16]

Gerig's progressive spirit was demonstrated in his attitude toward new inventions. He was the first member in his church to have a telephone in his home and one of the very earliest to have his

15 *Gospel Herald* (Scottdale), Oct. 9, 1930, p. 607. Daniel Graber was the father of Chris L. Graber of Goshen, Indiana, and of Joseph D. Graber, Elkhart, Indiana. These brothers haye been active in the educational and missionary work of the Mennonite Church for many years.

16 These are Bishop Vernon Gerig of the Sugar Creek Mennonite Church, Bishop Willard Leichty of the Bethel Mennonite Church, Wayland, Iowa, and Deacon Maynard Wyse, Archbold, Ohio. A granddaughter, Dr. Olive Wyse, has been a teacher at Goshen College for many years.

home wired for electricity. He requested a radio for his wife some time before his death and thus Mrs. Gerig was the first member of the family to have this convenience. His home was the first one in the Sugar Creek Amish Mennonite community to be equipped with a bathtub. He was one of the first in his church to own an automobile; he sold his team of black horses to buy it. When a small plane landed near Wayland in the early days of flying, he requested his grandson to take him to it so that he could say he had sat in a plane. He lived on a farm south of Wayland most of his life but retired from active farming in 1896. In 1903 he built a house in Wayland where he lived the rest of his life.

Perhaps few caught the spirit of the man better than his friend Alex Miller, columnist for the Davenport *Democrat,* who shortly after Gerig's death wrote the following paragraph in his column:

> Rev. Sebastian Gerig of Wayland was buried Saturday forenoon at Sugar Creek churchyard, a mile east and a mile south of Wayland. He was a remarkable man in his denomination. For more than half a century he was pastor of the Amish church east of Wayland. He was a conservative in the church, but not a radical, and he was one of the kindliest men we ever knew. He preached all these years without a penny of pay. He visited the sick, married the young folks, buried the dead and never got a penny in his life. He not only did all this church work and pastoral work, but he ran a big farm and raised a a large family. All are doing well and are fine citizens. The Lord surely prospered him, because all he had in his old age was what he had made as a farmer and worked more for others than himself. His wife was a daughter of Rev. Joseph Goldsmith, who was his predecessor in the church. Rev. Gerig was born in Germany, but came to this country by way of Ohio, in his youth. He never learned to talk English very well, altho he read and spoke it very intelligently. But he always talked brokenly. He perhaps never saw a grammar in his life. His education was limited, but he knew life. It is not at all likely that he knew rhetoric from differential calculus, but he knew humanity. He never saw a book on psychology but he knew how to make and hold friends and the good he did cannot be measured. This writer has long had a great admiration for this pioneer preacher. His church held to the peculiar customs as to attire among its members, but he did not adhere to this so very closely. He believed in progress and he went forward as the world went forward. But best of all, and over all was his innate kindness, his high idealism, his fidelity to the truth. He saw good in every church. He was a devout Amishman or Mennonite, but found no fault in others. If Rev. Sebastin Gerig has not gone on to glory, then all the rest of us might as well hang our harps on willow trees and mourn as those who have no hope. He was a good man.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES

A NEWLY DISCOVERED SOURCE ON THE TRANSMIGRATION OF THE HUTTERITES TO TRANSYLVANIA, 1621-1623

EDITED BY ROBERT FRIEDMANN*

That the Hutterites moved from Moravia and Slovakia into Transylvania in 1621 upon the urgent request of Prince Bethlen Gabor has been well known from the two published chronicles of this brotherhood. But the Great Chronicle does not give any details of this important event, and the Small Chronicle devotes hardly more than one page and a half to the story of this new beginning,[1] apparently taken from an anonymous hymn which recounts some more details.[2] Recently a new document was discovered which represents obviously the very source of this hymn, allowing us a first hand insight into the circumstances and difficulties of this new venture and its motives. We are happy to make this new source now available, thus enriching the treasure of Anabaptist history source material. Since it was discovered in the Archives of the (Catholic) bishop of the city of Nitra, Slovakia (German, *Neutra*), we may fittingly call it the "Codex Nitra." It is really but a small paperbound codex of 39 leaves quarto size, written as a *Hausbuch* or chronicle for 1623 to 1641 by the Hutterite brother Jacobus Werner, schoolteacher of Alvinc, Transylvania, formerly teacher at the Bruderhof of Dämberschitz, Moravia, who was himself part of the first transmigration group to the distant settlement. Strangely eough, this booklet was not known to Joseph Beck, the editor of the *Geschichtsbücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich* (1883), otherwise a real expert on all Hutteriana. He was familiar with the Provincial Archives of Nitra but somehow missed the small codex in the Episcopal Archives of the same city, in whose printed catalogue of 1886 our book was published for the first time, leaves 1 to 6 in extenso, and leaves 7 to 39 in regests. I am much indebted to Mr. Bela Krisztinkovich of Buda-Pest, Hungary, connoisseur and collector of Anabaptist or Haban ceramics, who found this old and remote publication and was kind enough to send me a reproduction of it. Of course, we do not know how this *Hausbuch* ever came to Nitra, but we remember that in the eighteenth century a wholesale confiscation of Hutterite writings by the Jesuits took place. These Jesuits then stored their loot in different libraries all over Hungary and Transylvania, where they still may be found today. The text published below is an exact reproduction of the catalogue text of 1886, leaves 1 to 6.

The fact that a group of Hutterites was more or less compelled to migrate to far-away Transylvania (then under Turkish suzerainty), and to start a settlement there, has been looked upon by the Hutterites as a great misfortune. It meant a loss of that closely knit familistic brotherhood life which had made Hutterianism strong and enduring in the face of many external hardships. Only in Slovakia, so we read, was there true brotherhood, which means the preservation of the tradition of the great past. Thus Transylvania was looked upon as an outpost down under

*Robert Friedmann until his retirement in 1961 was Professor of History and Philosophy at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

1 A. J. F. Zieglschmid, *Das Klein-Geschichtsbuch der Hutterischen Brüder* (Philadelphia, 1947), 138-39.

2 *Die Lieder der Hutterischen Brüder* (Scottdale, 1914), 827-35.

Turkish supervision, more or less lost to the great cause of Anabaptism. So at least it appeared to the chroniclers. However, by a strange twist of fate it was to develop otherwise. What had been thought of as the very center of Hutterite life, namely Slovakia, was finally to succumb to the attack of the intensified Counter-Reformation of the eighteenth century. And what was considered a hopeless branch out there almost in the Orient was miraculously saved, in face of tremendous odds, by the fusion of the old Hutterites (at the end hardly more than twenty souls) with Lutheran newcomers from Carinthia who brought about a complete revival and salvation of Hutterianism as a whole.[3] Thus the story of the transmigration into Transylvania gets a new significance, and the beginnings of the settlements there acquire a special interest.

HAUSS BUECH darein wier brueder zu Alwintz unser Hausz, Hof, Ackher, Weingarten, Gärtten, Wysen, und alle liegenden Gietter beschreiben, neben vorgeendem kurtzen bericht, unseren nachkimlingen durch welche mitel wier aus dem Märherrn in Sibenbirgen kommen: und hie niderglassen haben. 1623. Jacobus Werner, schreiber diss buchs.

Im jahre dess Herren 1620 den 26 tag Septembris kamb ein Herr Simon Bötsely, genandt Cantzler auss Sibenbirgen, in Märherren in unser haushaltung zur Neumühl, der bracht allda seiner ankhunfft ursach für, wie dass dero erweelten kö. Mt. in Hungern, Fürsten von Sibenbirgen etc.[4] begeeren were, unsere eltesten sollten auss den gemainten etwas der woll geübten handtwercks leutte in Sibenbirgen zu wonen zichen lassen. Auch er, Cantzler, selbst begeert unsers volkhs auf seine gietter, mit grosser zuesag, sie in aller freyheit vatterlich zu begaaben und in höchsten schuttz zu haltten.

Weillen es aber der natur schwer ist, von dem gewunnen zue dem ungewunnen und sunderlich sich in frömde lande zu begeben, sich niemandt gern understeet, lainten unsere Eltesten solches begeeren bey diesem Cantzler ainmal freindlicher ab. Also dass er sich widerumb haimb oder ja zu ihr Mt. wendet.

Baltt begaab es sich, das neben andern einwonnern dess landts die ganze gmain dess Herren durch kriegseinfall in ser grosse fluch und schaden kamb, also dass sich der unserigen ein grosser taill in irre und anderer herren schlösser und festung gantz bekumert aufhalten muesten. Wier aber, der andre tail, zugen mit weib und kindt den 28 tag Decembris gemelten 20-ten jahrs zu denen unseren lieben bruedern, die über der March wonten, und ainmall sunderlich auf Wessel, Newdorff und Protzka. Alda waren wier nit lang sicher, derhalben [wir] in Hungern nach Sabatisch wichen, und lag unser daselbst ein gross volkh drey wochenlang.

Indem kamb des kriegs unwesen auch hernach, das wier zu Sabatisch nit bleiben kundten. Da brach unser lieber getreuer Uhl Jausling, eltester der ganzen gmain Gottes, den 18 January 1621 mit allem volkh von Sabatisch auff. Auch etlich eltesten der gmain mit im, den zweyen kriegshörrn, die bey Wessel gegen einander zohen, mit weib und kindt zu entweichen, unwissend wohin er sich mit einem solchen grossen armen hauffen im ellend wenden solle.

Als nun die winterliche zeit [kam], kalt und ein guetaill kinder

3 Johann Loserth, "Decline and Revival of the Hutterites," *MQR*, IV (1930), 93-112.

4 Bethlen Gabor (i.e., Gabriel Bethlem), 1580-1629, Prince of Transylvania since 1621, a link between Hapsburg and Turkey. His first wife was Susanne Caroline, née Nagy-Karolyi, who died in 1622 (see note 8).

kranckh waren, muest sich die raiss kürzen, derhalben wendet sich brueder Uhl mit ainem taill des volckhess auf Wädiowitz, die anderen taillen sich auf Tura, Kostolan und Schächtitz auff der Herren Nadaschdj und Homonnay gietter, allda blieben wir als wochenlang in der einwoner heiser.

In solcher zeit kamen die königlich mandat von Tirnav an etliche herren deselben kraiss, man soll uns brüeder one ainigerlaj hindernuss herbergen, und wo wier im landt ankumen, trewlich in acht nemmen. Das geschah der ursach, in hoffnung königliches begeeren, so zuvor durch den Cantzler zur Newmüll beschehen, werde nun erstadt werden, und wardt auch alsbalt in derselben zeit widerumb an uns begert, wier solten in Sibenbirgen ziehen.

Die eltesten bewilligten ainmall diss, sie wolten etlich person schickhen das landt zu besehen, und wurden auch alsbalt von den eltesten etlich brüeder dahin zu ziehen verordnet. Nun aber empfieng ein herr aus dem Zärklland,[5] der Böldj Clement genant (damals in der armadj ein obrister) königlichen bevehl, er soll die brüeder die aus Märherren in Hungern geflohen mit weib und kindt sambt dem was sie haben aus iren herbergen zusamen nemmen, und mit glaid [Geleite] in Sibenbirgen schickhen, und gebietten, dass der höchste fleiss under grossem schutz ganz getrewlich im glaid sey.

Also schickht diser herr den 1 April gemelten 21 Jahrs ainen cappitän mit hundert reütern nach Wadiowitz, die namen den Conrath Hiertzl, hausshalter von Goblitz, und mit im etlich personen, firetens gen Schächtitz. Dess andern tags kamen drey capitain in die Schachtitzer Castel mit königlichen brieffeln, dero ain brüeff acht underschidliche teitsche artikl der freyheiten innenhielt, was wier uns in Sibenbirgen zu versehen haben werden, derhalben die cappitan nit gewart auf unser ja oder nain, ob wier ziehen wolten oder nit, namen also ainmall finfundachtzig seelen samb dem brueder Franz Walter, eltesten diener von Dämerschitz, und gemelten Conrath Hiertzl hausshalter, diese wurden mit 70 glaids personen zu ross und fuess auf 18 wägen fort gefiret den 2 April 1621.

Den 10 tag Appril kamen obgemelte capitän widerumb gehn Schächtitz und nammen den brueder Hanns Jacob Högler, kellner von Dämerschitz, auch mit hundert personen, die firetens durch glaid uns ersten nach, und also kamen unser hundertsechs und achtzig den 22 may gemelten jahrs gehn Dornburg in Sibenbirgen.

Morgens frue den 23 May tailt man uns in drey taill, den brueder Frantz Walter, diener, und Conrath Hiertzlen selb. 49-ter dem Simon Bölschy Cantzler auf sein guet Radnoth; den b(rueder) Hanns Jacob Högler selb. 88-ter zur Graffschafft Weissenburg[6]; den Hannss Frey oder Lochmiller Riemer, hausshalters gehülffen selb. 49-ter dem Böldj Clement gen Bodilän ins Zäckklandt. Dises taillen goss dem brueder Franzen und vil den andern bruedern die trähnen über die wangen, vorab weill nit all drey taill durchs Herren wort möchten getröstet werden. Gedachten auch an die acht artickhl, und wie dise taillung so strachkhs darwider sey. Darumb hielten die brüeder ernstlich an, man soll uns zusamen lassen, damit wier nit an unserer christllich gemainschafft und predig göttliches wortes also genzlich verhindert würden. Also schickht es Gott aus gnaden,

5 Zärkland, apparently Szeklerland, northern part of Transylvania, the domain of Hungarian Unitarianism.

6 Weissenburg, today Alba Iulia, formerly Karlsburg, a city on the Maros River, residence of Bethlen Gabor and seat of a famous university.

dass wier den 31 tag Augusti A° 1621 gehn Allwintz mit freuden zusammen kamen, darfür wir Gott herzlich lob und danckh sagten.

Den 6 Octobris dissgemelten jahres namb der Herr den brueder Frantzen Walter aus disem jammerthal zue seiner hailligen rue, da eifferten wier wiederumb desto mehr in der gmain Gottes; derhalben schickht man zween brueder, nemlich den Hanns Frey haushalters gehülffen von Lettnitz, und den Jacobus Werner,[7] schuelmeister von Dämmerschitz, zur gmain in Märherren der hoffnung, ob die gmain des Herren ein mitl funde, dass so uns wiederumb zu ir verhelffen möchte. Aber es wolt dahin nit glangen, derhalben unsre lieben vätter, die eltesten der gmain sich miteinander beriethen, uns einen andern diener des worts Gottes mit einem völkhl zur hülff zue schickhen, und muest auch darbey bleiben. Ja wier dankhten Gott, das uns noch ein solch beystandt von der gmain wiederfarren möcht.

Anno 1622, den 27 January gleich in dem da vorgenannte zween brueder in Märherren waren, kamb der Albrecht Bolsterl, der bey der königin zu Kaschau ein zeitlang gewesen[8] und sein weib von Nicolsburg zum hereinzug abgeholt hatte, den auch die eltesten zue einem fürgestellten bader verordneten. Der war selber achter.

Anno 1622 den 6 Martj kamb der brueder Albrecht Seill, eltester diener von Sabatisch, der bracht mit im sechs und achtzig seellen jung und alt, die uns aus der gmain zu einer hülff gschickht waren. Den 22 Octobris diss Jahrs kam der Daniel Schmid, säller haushalters gehülff von Nemschitz selb sechs und zwanzigster, diese wurden auch von der gmain hereingeschikht.

Anno 1622, den 23 Decembris kamb der Fellix Blied, haushälter von Masrovitz, aus der verfolgung der gantzen gmain zu Mären. Mit im schickhten die eltesten finff und achtzig personnen, das war der erste taill und weil die gmain den brueder Michl Kocher, eltesten diener von Masrovitz (der auff der räss zu Gross-Warttein entschlieff), auch herein schickht, waren bey im auch zwey und zwantzig personnen, und bracht der Felix haushalter 108 personen sambt seiner person.

Den 27 Decembris diss obgemelten jahres kamb der brueder Albrecht Grob, diener des worts von Masrowitz, und bracht mit im hundert nein personen. In demselben kamb auch der Toma Wilhelmb Pregintzer und Jäckl Riesch, haushalter von Olrekwitz,[9] die brachten mit zwey hundert achtundviertzig personnen.

Anno 1623 den 3 January kamb der Hänssl Müllhäisser, haushalters gehülff von Masrovitz, und bracht mit im hundert siben und viertzig personen, die all auss [dem] Massrovitzer gebiet waren. Den 4 January diss 23 Jahrs kamb der Lorentz Sima, ein kauffer von Oleckwinz, der bracht mit im hundert ein und finffzig seelen.

Da nun der brueder Albrecht Seill auch entschlieff, schickht uns die

7 Jacobus Werner, the writer of the present *Hausbuch*. He was a schoolteacher at the Bruderhof of Dämberschitz, Moravia, from which also came Franz Walter, the leader of the transmigration of 1621.

8 Kaschau, Slovakian Kosice, a beautifully situated medieval city formerly in the northern part of Transylvania, now in Slovakia. It has fine medieval buildings (a cathedral from the fourteenth century) and used to be the seat of the Hungarian nobility. Most likely it was also the homeplace of Queen Susanne Caroline (note 4), who apparently was a sick person. The fact that a Hutterite barber-surgeon treated her in Kaschau is new and adds to the story of Hutterite medicine and barbers. See article "Medicine, Hutterite," *Mennonite Encyclopedia*.

9 Olekowitz, the same as Alexowitz, village in Moravia, on the Iglava river, 7 miles south of Rossitz. To the manorial domain of Olekowitz (or Olkowitz) belonged also Moskowitz, Schakowitz and Pochtiz. For details see article "Olkowitz" by Dedic in *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, III, 299 f (not in *Mennonite Encyclopedia*).

gemain dess Herren zue einem eltesten diener des worts von Nemschitz den brueder Joseph Nägels, das waren acht seelen.

Den 29 July gmelten 23 jahrs kamb der brueder Albrecht Grob den man hinaus in Nider Ungarn[10] in die gmain des Herrn von hinen gschickht hat, umb ursach wegen wieder haimb, und bracht mit im zwelff personen.

Also lieben brueder haben wier einen bericht, wie und was gestalt wier die ersten, wider unseren willen, die anderer aber hernach aus christlicher liebe auf unser und königlich schriftlich und mintliches begehren zur hilf in diss landt Sibenbirgen komen sein.

Nun will [ich] auch hienach beschreiben was uns Gott der Herr unser getreuer vatter an hauss, hof, eckher, weinberg, gärten und andern ligenden giettern aus seiner sundern gnaden zu unsrer narung und erhaltung jetzt ainmall geben, und dan weiter bescheeren wirt, Er der Herr wolle uns beysamen erhalten, dass wier ime im bandt der liebe zue seinem hohen lob und preise alle zeit herzlich dienen mechten, das winschen wier uns yder zeit von herzen.

(fol. 6) Hauss und hofstadt [zu Alwintz].—Anno 1621 den 32 [23] tag Septembris kamb die Königin Susanna Caroli etc. auf Allwintz und als sy nun sah, das wir drey gettailte haufen allhie bey einander waren, war sie geflissen, uns ein hofstadt zu zaigen. Namb derhalb zu ir den Fodor Georgen, hofrichter, auch den Sackatsch Mihal, marckht richter, beide hie wonhaft, und hiess auch etliche brueder mitgehn, und zaight uns dise hofstadt, darauf wier jetzt wonnen. Hernach den 12 Martij 1622 wart dise hofstadt dem brueder Albrecht Seill ganz vellig zum bau übergeben, der dan auf den 25 tag April an der grossen stuben, als man anfing zu pawen, den ersten stain glegt hat.

Dieses hauss oder hofstadt hat aber eine solche gestalt und ligt nach den vier orten der welt, wie es in unserm hausbrief (welcher hernach von wort zu wort in diesen buech geschrieben ist)[11] da wier auf ein yedes ort underschidliche geber [Gebäude] haben.

Erstlich sted im hausbrief fürs erst der morgen plan, das ist die seiten unsers hof-fair und bader hauss, als dass wir den hinder tail oder den hintern hof nennen.—Zum andern wirt die mittägige seiten genent [gap in text), das ist da wier jetzt die schneiderstube und satler und riemer haben.—Zun driten meldets den nidergang [der Sonne], da wonen jetzt die messerer, weissgerber und hueter.—Zun vierten steet es das auf der mitnächtigen seiten der Fluss Marusch drin hinfliesse, das ist der orth, da wier jetzt die kirschnerstuben, das haupt eckh oder gibl unserer jetzigen gross stuben und ein tail unsseres hausgartens haben.

Es sein aber hinder der messerer stuben am Marusch fluss da es ein [im] brieff den niedergang nent, zwo salzhitten, die hat uns die königin zur hofstadt geschenkht, auf der ainen stell wo danegst ain messerer haus ist gewesen, stedt jetzt die klingen schmitten und segessen schmitten.[12]

10 Nieder-Ungarn (in contradistinction to Upper-Hungary which is today Slovakia), Hungary proper with Buda-Pest as center. Traveling from Transylvania to Slovakia, one has to cross this central part of the great Hungarian plain with its major artery, the Danube River.

11 *Hausbrief* or Charter. The Hutterites in Transylvania had two such charters, one of 1622 and one of 1625. Excerpts of the former are to be found in J. Loserth, *Der Communismus der Mährischen Wiedertäufer* (Vienna, 1894), 86. Excerpts of the latter can be found in Beck, *Geschichtsbücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1883), 427, note (in Latin): in a study by Professor Antal Aldassy in *Hungarian Historical Archive* (in the Magyar language), 1894; and in A. J. F. Ziegleschmid, "Grimmelshausens ungarische Wiedertäufer," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LIX (1940), 363.

12 *Sensenschmied*, maker of scythes.

(fol. 8) Bethlen Gabor's Hausbrief . . . gegeben in unserer stadt Weissenburg den vierten tag Jully im jahr Christ unseres Herren 1622.
(fol. 14) Kauffte stickl [Stück] zu haus und hofstadt wie volgt:
(fol. 17) Ackherfeldt oder landt, 1622-37
(fol. 23) Gärtten 1621-1641
(fol. 25) Wysen 1622-1641
(fol. 39) Weingärtten 1622-1623

A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY ANABAPTIST EVANGELISTIC TESTIMONY

Edited by Hans J. Hillerbrand[1]

The rapid spread of Anabaptism in the years after 1525 constitutes one of the remarkable characteristics of the early history of the movement. Since there seems to have existed, particularly following the Peasants' War, considerable dissatisfaction with the course of the Reformation as charted in Wittenberg, a most fruitful soil for the Anabaptist message was present.[2] The Anabaptist expansion would have been impossible, nonetheless, had it not been for the emphatic missionary vigor of the early Anabaptists who from the very beginning of the movement traversed Switzerland, Austria, and South Germany spreading the Anabaptist message.[3]

At the roots of such Anabaptist activity lay the postulate of a radical dualism between the *Kingdom of God* and the *World,* where the former was identified with the Anabaptist congregations.[4] All those not belonging to these congregations, on the other hand, were godless, World, and became thus the object of missionary activity. In this vein one Austrian Anabaptist declared bluntly that all those outside their congregations were heathen.[5] Similarly the chronicler Sebastian Franck observed that the Anabaptists called each other brothers, "but those who did not belong to their sect were not even greeted."[6]

The Reformers found themselves in a different position in this regard, since they did not share the Anabaptist dualism between the Kingdom of God and the World. Luther said the true church remains invisible, hidden underneath the empirical church. Thus it was altogether possible that a Catholic was part of the true church. Consequently, the Reformers never proselytized among each other. Missionary activity had to be undertaken exclusively among the heathen. This was altogether a different matter, by several reasons made virtually impossible for the Reformers as well as the Anabaptists.[7]

1 This note is a revised translation of an article which appeared originally as "Ein täuferisches Missionszeugnis aus dem 16. Jahrhundert," in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* LXXI (1960), 324-27. It is published here upon request of the editor of this journal.

2 Franz Lau, "Der Bauernkrieg und das angebliche Ende der lutherischen Reformation als spontaner Volksbewegung," *Luther-Jahrbuch 1959,* 109 ff., has recently attempted to destroy the customary view that Luther's attitude in the Peasants' War meant the end of popular support for Luther. I do not find his evidence altogether convincing.

3 Wilhelm Wiswedel, "Die alten Täufergemeinden und ihr missionarisches Wirken," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* (hereafter cited as *ARG*), XL (1943); XLI (1948). Franklin H. Littell, "The Anabaptist Theology of Missions," *MQR,* XXI (1947).

4 This is an area of Anabaptist studies which would merit further investigation. Cf. Robert Friedmann, "The Doctrine of the Two Worlds," *The Recovery of the Anabaptist Vision,* Guy F. Hershberger, ed. (Scottdale, 1957).

5 Hartmann Ammann, *Die Wiedertäufer in Michelsburg und deren Urgichten* (Brixen, 1896), 16.

6 Sebastian Franck, *Chronica, Zeytbuch und Geschychtbibel* (Strasbourg, 1531), 444.

7 There is no agreement in scholarship regarding the attitude of the Reformers toward missions. For some scholars the Reformers maintained that the Great Commission was no

The Anabaptist missionary activity soon reached its apex, a fact attributable either to the severe suppression of the movement or to a loss of the original Anabaptist vision. More pertinent, however, seems the observation that the Anabaptists soon found themselves, after the widespread establishment of Anabaptist congregations, in essentially the same situation as the Reformers. Whereas initially Anabaptist missionary activity had been mandatory as a means of spreading the movement in order to establish the Kingdom of God concretely in different places, such activity soon ceased to be necessary on account of the already existing Anabaptist congregations. The task remaining was evangelistic activity within the local territory. It was undoubtedly carried out energetically, but conveyed the impression that the Anabaptist missionary thrust had come to a standstill.

This general development within Anabaptism is not paralleled by the situation prevailing among the Hutterian brotherhood in Moravia. Here the brotherly sharing of goods was seen as the *sine qua non* of the Christian faith. Thus the original Anabaptist dualism between the Kingdom of God and the World was redefined in a specific Hutterite sense which saw the former find concrete expression in the Hutterite communities. Thereby even non-Hutterian Anabaptists became an object of missionary endeavor.

It is difficult to ascertain either the extent or the effect of such Hutterian missionary activity, inasmuch as it was, after all, an underground movement undertaken as secretly as possible.[8] Doubtless there was extensive communication between Moravia and South Germany throughout most of the century. Probably the Hutterian missionaries were sent to their former home region where relatives and former acquaintances provided easy initial contacts. A letter written by such a Hutterian missionary who had returned to his former home is herewith presented in English translation.[9] Its uniqueness lies in the fact that it is not, like most extant Anabaptist epistolary literature, addressed to someone within the Anabaptist brotherhood. The recipient in this case was an outsider who must have expressed, on one occasion, his interest in the Anabaptist message. It is the intention of the letter to summarize briefly the main characteristics of the Anabaptist faith, obviously in order to persuade the recipient to join the brotherhood. The letter is therefore not only an important testimony to Anabaptist missionary activity, but also presents a succinct statement of Anabaptist piety in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Little is known about the writer, Hanns Schlegel. According to the *Hutterite Chronicle* he was a tailor by trade, came originally from Württemberg, and was in 1568 elected to be preacher.[10] Six years later he must have been back in his home region, for a church inspection record *(Visitationsprotokoll)* informs us that Schlegel spent some time in the summer of 1574 in the vincinity of Maulbronn in Württemberg.[11] Probably the present letter was written shortly after Schlegel's departure from this region. Both the date of the letter (July 3, 1574) and the intro-

longer operative. Cf. Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* (New York, 1939), III, 25. Others, however, insist on the vital missionary concern of the Reformers. Cf. Walter Holsten, "Reformation und Mission," *ARG*, XLIV (1953), 1-31.

8 *Gerhard J. Neumann*, "Von und nach Mähren. Aus der Täufergeschichte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts," *ARG*, XLVIII (1957).

9 Staatsarchiv Ludwigsburg, Germany, Sign. A 282.

10 *Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder*, A.J.F. Zieglschmid, ed. (Ithaca, New York, 1943), 426, 459, 549.

11 *Quellen zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer*, I: *Herzogtum Württemberg* (Leipzig, 1930), 422.

ductory comment that the writer would have wished for a personal visit make this quite probable. Nothing at all is known about the recipient of the letter, except his first name, Caspar, which is found in the greeting. The *Täuferakten* have no reference to anyone who could possibly be identified with Caspar.

The argument of the letter is extremely simple. Schlegel begins with the admonition that Caspar should not be perturbed by the hardness and incomprehensibility of the Gospel. It is difficult indeed to be a Christian. For this means to give up one's own will, to go the narrow path which Christ has walked before us, to drink the cup of bitter suffering and cross which Christ offers to all His disciples. And as seal of all this the true believer accepts the gracious covenant of baptism through which he renounces the world, sin, the devil, and all the lust of this world.

The Text of the Letter in Translation

I wish you grace and mercy from God to know His eternal will through Jesus Christ both now and forever. Amen.

Dear Caspar:

Simon Kress, who visited with you, informed me that I should come to you. Time did not allow it, however, since I had to proceed hurriedly to other places. I understand that you desire to hear our belief. This we are always ready to show forth for the sake of neighborly love, concern for God, and hunger for true righteousness as we have the grace of God. You also asked for the Confession of our faith, which I am sending you herewith for two or three weeks. God grant that it may serve you to salvation and eternal peace. Perhaps it will seem to you in some parts difficult and incomprehensible. I pray you not to look at the matter with flesh and blood; for flesh and blood do not point to salvation. The reason is that they must here lose their will and die if man is to become sensitive and be made alive in Christ. Therefore Christ admonishes us of the narrow way and the straight path. The old Adam must decay and die, which is a difficult and hard thing. Thus there are few who find Him, though many long to enter in, but are not able to do it. The reason is easily seen: The path and way to heaven is called the gate of death. This way and path is Christ, full of rejection, pain, and suffering. Christ is standing outside this gate in His poverty, yea, with His bloody robe and crown of thorns, with the cup of the bitter cross and suffering, which He offers to those who want to be His heirs. Christ is also standing with the gracious Covenant of Baptism, in which are denounced the world, sin, devil, as well as all lust of the world and love of creature—house, farm, wife, children, money and goods. Thus the old Adam is to be drowned and killed. Many are frightened and scared away from this gate of death, which fact we see in the rich young ruler. When the Lord proposed such *Gelassenheit* and death to him, he was sad and left. Such is the case if one is immersed in the lust of this world and in riches. Then it is indeed difficult; Christ is far too poor and too simple. Then one begins to seek many excuses. Then the Scriptures must suffer themselves to be bent backwards and forwards to find the wide way which is not so hard and another door to heaven. But the Lord calls them thieves and murderers. Therefore, dear Caspar, if you seek the kingdom of God, you seek rightly. Be not frightened by the rejection of Christ and manifold denunciation. For what happened to Him must also happen to all His disciples. May Almighty God give this knowledge to you and to all who inquire and hunger after righteousness, so that those who are meant

for life and holiness may be gathered, those who esteem highly the covenant of God. This I wish from my heart through our Savior Jesus Christ. Please accept my simple letter with benevolence and read this our Confession profitably that it may be for your good. This is my heart's wish to you.

Written the 3rd day of July in the 74th year.
Hanns Schlegel, sent to preach the Gospel of Our Salvation.

MENNO SIMONS AND THE NORTH AMERICAN MENNONITES OF SWISS-SOUTH GERMAN BACKGROUND

A Reflection on the Occasion of the Quadricentennial of His Death

Menno Simons was buried 400 years ago, on January 29, 1561. The place was his own garden in the village of Wüstenfelde, which lay between Hamburg and Lübeck near Oldesloe and Fresenburg in Holstein, North Germany, then under the sovereignty of the King of Denmark. To this quiet place Menno, as well as numerous other "Mennist" refugees, had come for safety, fleeing the tribulation of persecution. From 1543 on, the owner of the domain of Fresenburg, Baron Bartholomew von Ahlefeldt, had made it a place of refuge for such harried Christians. Though he himself was not one of them, he defended them against repeated attempts of the king to exterminate them, and defied all orders to expel them, including the royal mandates of 1555 and 1557. Fresenburg was the center of a substantial Mennonite congregation as well as the location of a Mennonite printery, possibly owned by Menno. Menno himself did not arrive here until the late summer of 1554, coming here from Lübeck.

At Fresenburg and Wüstenfelde Menno had a safe retreat for the last seven years of his life, completing twenty-five years in the service of Christ and his brotherhood following his baptism in January 1536 and his ordination as elder in 1537. But his residence in this place was not withdrawal from responsibility and ministry. In the first place, he was the bishop of the Fresenburg congregation, where he apparently ordained two ministers, Michael Steffen and Dirk Eggerat, both living at near-by Oldesloe.

In the second place, he still retained his general leadership in the Mennonite brotherhood of North Germany and Holland. For instance, in 1557 he was called to Friesland, his old home territory, to assist in solving a serious schism in the church, but alas, in vain. It was on this occasion that he wrote the sad words: "If the omnipotent God had not preserved me last year as well as now, I would already have gone mad. For there is nothing upon earth which my heart loves more than it does the church, and yet I must live to see this sad affliction upon her." In the same year an appeal came to him from the important and large Strasbourg Anabaptist Conference not to go to extremes on the application of the ban and excommunication in discipline, but he rejected the appeal. A sad result of this disagreement was the mutual rejection of each other as brethren by the Mennist group in the North led by Menno, and the South German-Swiss Brethren group.

In the third place, Menno dedicated himself to a revision of most of his earlier writings which had been printed in the years 1539-44 in Holland. After a gap of seven years he had resumed writing and publication, for beginning in 1551 Menno and the Anabaptists had a printer

at Lübeck who in 1554 moved to Oldesloe and later in the same year to Fresenburg. Several new books were written and printed in these years at Fresenburg, the last appearing in 1560. During his life a total of twenty-five writings of varying length were written by Menno, amounting to a total of over one thousand large-size pages in the latest edition of his complete writings.

The four hundredth anniversary of Menno's death after a life filled with devoted labors in the cause of the church he loved "more than anything on earth" gives us, his midtwentieth-century descendants in faith, occasion to renew our evaluation and appreciation of the man and his work. Although we of the Mennonite Church in North America descend both literally and spiritually from the South German-Swiss Brethren and thus received no direct influence from him while he was living, we have been greatly benefited by his writings. Our first forefathers, who came to Germantown and Skippack in 1683-1725, brought Dutch copies of his books with them, and their descendants, beginning in 1794 at Lancaster, reprinted German and English translations of his great *Foundation Book* at least nine times. Editions of his complete works were published in both languages in 1871 and 1876-81 by J. F. Funk, and once later in German in 1926 by J. A. Raber. A splendid new translation of his complete writings was made available by the Mennonite Publishing House in 1956. edited by J. C. Wenger, translated by Leonard Verduin. No Mennonite writer has had such a great influence upon our own brotherhood and the entire worldwide Mennonite family as Menno.

Menno's motto, printed on the title page of each of his books, was taken from I Cor. 3:11: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." It is the motto of our whole brotherhood in the deepest sense, for only in Christ and Him alone do we trust for our salvation, on Him alone do we build the church, and Him alone do we follow in our discipleship. Menno lived his motto as the spiritual leader and general shepherd of the growing and widely scattered Dutch-North Germany Anabaptist brotherhood. He was chiefly responsible for directing it on the path of a sound Biblical and practical Christianity. He stood for a high standard of life, a strong church pattern, a vigorous evangelism and a great vision of the obedience of faith in following Christ to the uttermost.

We Swiss-South German Mennonites and Amish Mennonites can rejoice and be grateful to God for our inheritance from Menno Simons, including our name. That we got the name late, and only incidentally, makes no difference. It has been ours since Germantown, and Menno has been ours almost from the beginning. We join with our Dutch, North German, and Russian brethren in a common remembrance of the man God gave us in a time of great need, and through whom much blessing has come to all of us. (Reprinted from the *Gospel Herald*)

Goshen College Biblical Seminary HAROLD S. BENDER

American Christianity. An Interpretation With Representative Documents. Volume I, 1607-1820. By H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher. New York: Scribner's Sons, ca. 1960. Pp. 620, index and bibliographies. $10.00.

This volume is the first of a projected two-volume history of Christianity in America. The second volume is to be forthcoming in 1961 or early 1962. As the title indicates, the subject matter of this work is limited to Christianity in contrast to many of the textbooks on "religion" in America. As the subtitle indicates, the volume attempts to break new ground in the field of historical writing by correlating interpretation and documents into an integrated whole. It is not simply a source book with brief introductions such as P. G. Mode published in 1921, although within the volume are a large number of basic source materials and extensive bibliographies. Neither is it an interpretation of American church history simply supplemented by documents for the convenience of the reader. The interpretative text is related, if not tied, to the documents. Indeed, one of the most significant things about this book is the innovation in its organization and format.

Each major division represents a chronological period (e.g., "Period I, 1607-1690") and is introduced with a general essay of approximately 1,500 words. Following this, the subsections or chapter divisions which deal with traditions or movements within American Christianity (e.g., Chapter I, "Churchly Traditions") begin with an interpretative survey. This latter introduction is approximately 2,000 words, and is more closely related to the primary documents which are included in the chapter. Then come the documents themselves, each introduced with another essay of 400-500 words. The documents represent the different and variegated denominational and sectional developments which make up the American church scene.

The obstacles to be overcome in making a co-ordinated and coherent whole out of such a format are readily apparent, and might have frightened less adventurous authors. Perhaps the most obvious problems are repetition and a lack of an organizational center. With the arrangement of telescoping introductions some sheer repetition was unavoidable, particularly in the subsections, but it has been kept to a minimum.

The more formidable problem is the one of an organizing center. In a venture of this kind, the problem is compounded. There is, of course, the problem of finding a principle of selection which will give coherence to the work and at the same time fairly represent the diversification of the historical scene. All writers of history must face this problem. For our authors, however, the problem is complicated by the further difficulty of making the introductions to the documents fulfill both the task of adequately introducing the lengthy and significant source materials which are more than illustrative supplements, and at the same time move the discussion forward. How can the documents be kept from being interruptions? The standard way has been to separate interpretation and documents and bridge the gap with footnotes. *American Christianity* breaks with this tradition and makes an admirable and on the whole successful attempt to integrate the two, showing explicitly the intimate relationship which must exist between historical interpretation and the documentary sources.

The selection of material and the interpretation seem clearly aimed at showing how the seeds of ecumenicity have been sown and cultivated in the American soil almost from the beginning. This thematic principle of selection has proved to be a most fortunate one. On the one hand, it has required the inclusion of the greatest possible variety of religious groups and issues, but on the other, it has focused the attention of the authors on the major forces—social, political and theological—which have molded the many denominations and sects that were transplanted from the Old World or given birth in the New, into the phenomenon known as American Christianity. The authors are convinced that religious, moral and theological considerations have been more significant in this development than many interpretations of American history have granted. Accordingly, although they have by no means ignored the larger socio-economic and political environment and its influence on the formation of the American churches, they have given a predominant place, particularly in the selection of primary documents, to the life and thought of the church itself. To understand the significance of this, one needs only compare it with the declared intention of P. G. Mode to include in his *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide* "only such documents as most significantly set forth the contribution that the church has made to the progress of American society, and the manner in which from time to time she has adjusted herself to the new and changing environment" (p. v).

The book, as the dust jacket indicates, is the product of "careful collaboration" and "collective thinking." The potential difficulties inherent in joint authorship have been overcome and, in fact, turned into a distinct advantage. Each of the authors represents a different denominational background and focus of specialization, yet all of them have been working for years in the field of American church history. While individual interpretations are sometimes apparent, no overt contradictions have been noted by this reviewer. Indeed, the style is of such even quality that it is not clear from a mere reading which of the authors have been responsible for which chapters. One interesting variation in interpretation may be seen in the description of the emergent Baptist group in the Southwark church as "Brownist" on page 85 (Smith) and the rather apparent avoidance of such connections in the further account on page 144 (Handy).

Several features call for brief comment. The documents which have been included are generally quoted at length rather than chopped into fragments. This, it seems to the reviewer, is a definite advantage even though it means that fewer documents could be represented. The excellent bibliographies have been mentioned, but their presence should be underscored. Added to these are many helpful footnotes. All of these features make this book a useful tool for further research in American church history.

Mennonite readers will be interested to note that two documents illustrating the early Mennonite settlement and organization have been included, but a moment of reflection upon the nature of the documents should raise a second thought about the relation and impact (or lack of it) of Mennonite principles upon the larger church community. A careful search for documents that were genuinely Mennonite and typical of the tradition turned up only a letter which poignantly expresses the hope of persecuted Anabaptists for an opportunity to live in peace, and a description of the organizing of a congregation at Germantown. It is

true that there are several other documents that might have been used, but they would not have changed the picture materially.

As the pages of this volume strikingly, but unintentionally, show, while Quakers, Baptists and other newly-created American sects aggressively entered into the leavening process of American culture, Mennonites remained apart. They were more concerned to be unrelated to American Christianity—to be God's "peculiar people"—than to risk contamination by participating in the main stream of American religious life. While we, their descendants, can sympathetically explain the historical influences and religious convictions which led them to adopt such a quietistic nonconformity, we can no longer justify in ourselves a similar disregard for the religious situation of our own day. The total impact of this book acutely raises the question of the mutual relationship of the Anabaptist tradition and American Christianity which we can no longer avoid.

Goshen College C. Norman Kraus

Menno Simons van Witmarsum. Voorman van de Doperse beweging in de lage landen. By J. A. Brandsma. Drachten: Laverman, 1960. 125 pp., paperback, $2.

J. A. Brandsma, a Dutch Baptist minister, studied at the Baptist Theological Seminary at Rüschlikon-Zürich, where he wrote a B.D. thesis on "The Transition of Menno Simons from Roman Catholicism to Anabaptism as Reflected in His Writings" (1955). Later some of his articles appeared in *It Beaken.* In the article "Anabaptistica Frisica," he reviewed Mennonite Quarterly Review articles written by William Keeney and C. J. Dyck dealing primarily with Dirk Philips (Vol. XXI, No. 6, December, 1959). In Vol. XXII, No. 2, June, 1960, he wrote an article, "Ontstaan en eerste jaren van de doperse beweging in Friesland," in which he begins an account of the early Anabaptist movement in the province of Friesland. He continued the account in the October issue of the same magazine in the two articles, "Is Obbe Filips wer roomst wurden?" and "Ta de studzje fan Minne Simens," and in an article in *Mennonite Life* entitled "Menno Simons as a Frisian" (Vol. XVI, January 1961).

Some of his writings in *It Beaken,* published by the Frisian Academy (Fryske Akademy), were published in the Frisian language. A native of this province, deeply interested in the Anabaptist movement, Brandsma has demonstrated that he has a special interest in the Frisian background of Anabaptism and is well qualified to get the "feel" of the life and times of the Frisian Menno Simons.

Now we have before us the biography of Menno Simons written by J. A. Brandsma under the sponsorship of the Fryske Akademy, Leeuwarden, published as number 181, in which he presents the story of the celebrated native son of Friesland in connection with the 400th anniversary of the death of Menno Simons. Brandsma has succeeded well in making Menno live. He is better qualified to present details of the Frisian life of the days of Menno than outsiders and has made full use of this.

Brandsma follows the life of Menno Simons closely, filling in generously, particularly as far as his early life is concerned, where facts are not available. Since he appeals to the general reader, that is justified, particularly since he never gives the reader the impression that he presents historical facts where they are lacking. The early youth, therefore, described vividly and attractively by the author, could easily have been the actual

life lived by Menno. Occasionally one could raise some questions, for example when the author states that "the young Menno possibly made the decision to become a priest at the age of nine" (p. 10). In view of the fact that Menno did not become a priest until he was twenty-eight and did not get a very thorough training for the priesthood, it is not only questionable but unlikely that he or his parents had actually decided that he should become a priest at the age of nine. This is merely to point out the dangers the author is exposed to when he fills in generously where historical facts are not available. On the other hand, the colorful details make this booklet a readable and convincing presentation of the life story of Menno.

Brandsma devoted two chapters to Menno's views on the church and church discipline. He points out that these views differ from those of the Catholic and Protestant churches, since Menno emphasizes the otherworldly nature of the church of Christ, which he and his followers aimed to realize in some measure.

The author has made a thorough study of the writings of Menno Simons, the existing biographies of Menno, and other studies pertaining to the various aspects of his life, writings, theology, and significance. Only occasionally one finds that some of the studies escaped his attention. He follows closely the pattern established by preceding biographers. Since it is a popular presentation of the life of Menno, the author is not very generous with footnoting his sources. Most of his footnotes refer to the writings of Menno. Those who will want to check and verify other presentations in the book will have difficulty locating them unless they are specialists in the field. The footnotes for each chapter are found at the end of the book. In addition to this, there is an enlarged bibliography with reference to each chapter without footnotes. The index is helpful in locating desired information. The cover of this paperback has the well-known etching of Menno produced by Carel van Sichem. Opposite the title page, Menno's hand-written letter to a widow is reproduced. This book also has a picture of the Menno Simons monument at Witmarsum.

The author can be congratulated on his achievement and must be welcomed into the widening circle of Mennonite and other scholars devoted to research and the presentation of their findings pertaining to the life and times of Menno Simons.

Bethel College CORNELIUS KRAHN

Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation. By Roland H. Bainton. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. Pp. 299. $4.75.

Bainton's long-awaited book traces the story of war and peace in Christian history in terms of three attitudes—pacifism, the just war, and the crusade—involving three interpretations of Romans 13, all of which had appeared in this chronological order by the end of the Middle Ages, and all of which have reappeared continuously since then.

Pacifism is rooted in the New Testament and regards the coercive power of the state as ordained of God because of sin. Viewing the world with considerable pessimism, it remains aloof in varying degrees from the state. The concept of just war, taken over in part from pagan classical thought and incorporated in the natural law theology of the Middle Ages, agreed that the state was ordained because of sin, but that Christians, though not needing it for themselves, should nevertheless assume respon-

sibility for the state, even participating in war with a motive of love when it is fought for the restraint of evil and the good of humanity. The crusade is the holy war under the auspices of the church or a religious leader, not in behalf of justice, but of an ideal. Drawing its inspiration from the Old Testament, the crusade involves a theocratic view of the state, holding that it is ordained of God not only because of sin, but also as a means by which the righteous may exercise an effective control of society.

The just war theory was introduced to Christendom by Ambrose and Augustine, revived during the Renaissance, supported by Luther, and remains even to this day the prevailing theoretical position of both Catholicism and Protestantism.

The crusade emerged with the Medieval Crusades, was accepted at least in part by Calvin, promoted by Cromwell, was used by the New England Puritans against the Indians, and, mixed with hysterical nationalism, became the motivating force of American participation in World War I. By its very nature the crusade de-emphasizes not only the justice of its cause, but just methods for its conduct as well. Bainton concludes, therefore, that "war is more humane when God is left out of it." Thus the Archbishop of Mainz (1182), while renouncing the sword in obedience to the letter of the law, nevertheless killed nine men in battle with a club.

Pacifism, the prevailing pre-Constantinian atittude, was revived by the medieval sects, the Anabaptists, and the Quakers. The Enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries witnessed the rise of a more secular pacifism which both influenced Christian thought and was influenced by it. Philosophers satirized the just war, Kant declared there was no such thing, and nations at war deliberately declined to use some of their more potent weapons. The peace movement of the nineteenth century in America and England was a blend of Christianity and rational idealism.

Of the pacifist churches the Quakers have been most influenced by rationalistic pacifism. William Penn's *Peace of Europe* has an "amazingly secular tone"; only in the conclusion is the Christian note introduced. John Bright is cited as the example of the possibilities and limits of pacifism in government. (1) He may legitimately appeal to his nonpacifist colleagues to live up to their own professed ethic. (2) In parliament he may not stand in the way of implementation of policies adopted by the majority, in accord with their principles. (3) He cannot share in framing or executing policies contrary to his own principles. Therefore he cannot hold executive office, only legislative. As a pacifist of Quaker-like persuasion himself, Bainton draws the Quaker line of action between politics and war.

Despite American idealism and isolationism, mixed with some pacifism, American foreign relations have not produced too much achievement. In his attitude to the Hague conferences Theodore Roosevelt does not show up too favorably when compared with Nicholas II. Then from isolation we plunged into a crusade, followed by more isolationism and a renewal of pacifism, again followed by Niebuhrism and World War II and its aftermath.

Today there is an emergent pacifism, based not on principle, but on fear and the desire for survival. Much even of the pacifism of the 1920's was of this variety. Even the Quaker Hoover made his appeal for peace on the basis of the hideousness of war. There can be no peace without a

genuine will for peace, and this has been lacking even in much of the religious pacifism of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Bainton summarizes his own pacifist credo as follows: (1) Christians must base their position on the principles of the New Testament. (2) Neither the just war nor the crusade can be squared with these principles. (3) This leaves pacifism as the only Christian position.

Bainton gives an excellent analysis of the various attitudes to war and peace in the history of Christendom, as well as of the varieties of pacifism. The attitudes of the American churches in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is enlightening. His defense of his own position is supported by an able refutation of the Niebuhrian anti-pacifist dialectic: Responsibility, involvement, the lesser evil, irrelevance, the nation acting in its own interest, private versus public morals, the preferential ethic. He insists that as protection of one's own life is not the ultimate good, neither is that of the family or the nation. His discussion of nonviolence includes a helpful distinction between nonviolent coercion and nonviolent persuasion.

The author is fair to his opponents. While rejecting their ethic as well as their exegesis, he hastens to say the exegesis has value "because those who reject an exacting ethic may better keep it intact than those who, having accepted it, are then under the temptation to pare it down to the level of the attainable. Not vengeance, not retaliation, but compassion and reconciliation are the Christian notes." (262). In another instance he recognizes that "The Catholic Church has done better than Protestantism in taking these sayings [the vigorous nonresistant precepts of the New Testament] at face value, though it has avoided their unversal application by relegating them to the monastery."

As Bainton views the current world situation it seems dark, and yet there are grounds for hope. Then in an admirable sentence he concludes, "But if not" (that is, if in spite of these hopes and of the Christian imperative another World War does break forth), then in the words of the three Hebrew youths, "be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." (266)

The historical survey is excellent, the writing carries the sprightly pungent style which we have come to expect from Bainton, and the scholarship is of a high order. The book also carries the inevitable Bainton illustrations, many of them cartoons. In a few cases, however, sweeping generalizations and striking figures of speech, while making for a story well-told, also lead to exaggeration, misleading interpretations, or even violence to facts. For example, the statement that the Mennonites agreed with the argument of Celsus that the Christian must either go to war or retire to the desert, that " the only valid pacifism is monasticism," (252) is carrying a point just a little too far. Neither is it true that the Pennsylvania Mennonites refused to vote. It may also be noted that the American Peace Society was organized in 1828, not 1838. The Second Hague Conference was held in 1907, not 1906.

Goshen College GUY F. HERSHBERGER

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXV, 1961

JANUARY

Editorial 4

Anabaptism in Central Germany: II. Faith and Life 5
John S. Oyer

Doctrinal Implications in Sixteenth Century Anabaptist Hymnody 38
Rosella Reimer Duerksen

Grace and Discipleship in Anabaptism 50
John C. Wenger

Mukyokai-Shugi: A Modern Japanese Attempt to Complete the Reformation 70
Paul Peachey

Book Reviews 79
Siegfried Rother, *Die religiösen und geistigen Grundlagen der Politik Huldrych Zwinglis*
Heinrich Schmid, *Zwinglis Lehre von der göttlichen und menschlichen Gerechtigkeit*
Reviewed by John H. Yoder

APRIL

Editorial 90

John Wesley's Doctrine of Sanctification and Perfection 91
William R. Cannon

"Walking in the Resurrection": The Anabaptist Doctrine of Regeneration and Discipleship 96
Harold S. Bender

The Discipline of Discipleship in the Free Church Tradition 111
Franklin H. Littell

Current Theological Emphases in the American Holiness Tradition 120
William M. Arnett

Some Anabaptist Views on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit 130
Walter Klaassen

The Anabaptist Position on Baptism and the Lord's Supper 140
Gerhard J. Neumann

Possibilities of Erasmian Influence on Denck and Hubmaier in Their Views on the Freedom of the Will 149
Thor Hall

Bibliographical and Research Notes 171
A Comparative Study of Traditional and Emergent Family Types Among Midwest Mennonites
Howard Kauffman
The Canadian Mennonites
George G. Thielmann

Book Reviews 177
Paul L. Maier, *Caspar Schwenckfeld on the Person and Work of Christ*
Reviewed by William Klassen

Gunnar Westin, *The Free Church Through the Ages*
Reviewed by Cornelius J. Dyck
Clifton E. Olmstead, *History of Religion in the States*
Reviewed by C. Norman Kraus
Mary Miller, *A Pillar of Cloud: The Story of Hesston College, 1909-1959*
Reviewed by John Umble

Mennonite Encyclopedia: Supplement to Corrections 184

JULY

Editorial 186

The Theology of Menno Simons 187
J. A. Oosterbaan

A Newly Discovered Manuscript of Melchior Rinck 197
Gerhard J. Neumann

Notes on the Rinck Manuscript 204
Harold S. Bender

The Anabaptist View of the Church and the Therapeutic Community 218
Myron Lester Ebersole

Attendance in Mennonite Colleges 1959-60 238
Silas Hertzler

Bibliographical and Research Notes 242
A Tribute to Robert Friedmann
Harold S. Bender
A Chronological Bibliography of the Writings of Robert Friedmann

OCTOBER

Editorial 250

Guido de Brès and the Anabaptists 251
Leonard Verduin

Sebastian Franck's Theory of Religious Knowledge 267
Eugene Peters

Anabaptism in Westphalia 282
Cornelius Krahn

The Otherness of the Church 286
John Howard Yoder

Sebastian Gerig (1838-1924): His Life and Times 297
Melvin Gingerich

Bibliographical and Research Notes 309
A Newly Discovered Source on the Transmigration of the Hutterites to Transylvania
Robert Friedmann
A Sixteenth-Century Anabaptist Evangelistic Testimony
Hans J. Hillerbrand
Menno Simons and the North American Mennonites of Swiss-South German Background
Harold S. Bender

Book Reviews 319
H. Shelton Smith, Robert T. Handy, and Lefferts A. Loetscher, *American Christianity*
Reviewed by Norman Kraus
J. A. Brandsma, *Menno Simons van Witmarsum*
Reviewed by Cornelius Krahn
Roland H. Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace*
Reviewed by Guy F. Hershberger
Index to Volume XXXV, 1961 325

Baptist Div Sch. 9